CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE

I.S.B.N.

THESES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

National Library of Canada
Collections Development Branch

Canadian Theses on
Microfiche Service

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction du développement des collections

Service des thèses canadiennes
sur microfiche

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

NL-339 (r. 82/08)

Canadä

0-315-08929-6

National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Canadian Theses Division
Division des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

-40

56846

PERMISSION TO MICROFILM — AUTORISATION DE MICROFILMER

- Please print or type — Écrire en lettres moulées ou dactylographier

Full Name of Author — Nom complet de l'auteur

MARIE LILLIAN MIDDLETON

Date of Birth — Date de naissance Jan. 25, 1934	Country of Birth — Lieu de naissance Canada

Permanent Address — Résidence fixe

11732- 39A Ave
Edmonton Alberta
T6J 0P2

Title of Thesis — Titre de la thèse

The Effect of Instructor Characteristics and Job-Related Activities on Teacher/Student Relationships in Two Diploma Nursing Programs

University — Université

University of Alberta

Degree for which thesis was presented — Grade pour lequel cette thèse fut présentée

Master of Education

Year this degree conferred — Année d'obtention de ce grade 1982	Name of Supervisor — Nom du directeur de thèse Dr. A. G. Konrad

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

Date April 26/82	Signature Marie L Middleton

NL-91 (4/77)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE EFFECT OF INSTRUCTOR CHARACTERISTICS AND JOB-RELATED ACTIVITIES ON TEACHER/STUDENT RELATIONSHIPS IN TWO DIPLOMA NURSING PROGRAMS

BY

© MARIE LILLIAN MIDDLETON

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA
SPRING 1982

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR Marie L. Middleton

TITLE OF THESIS THE EFFECT OF INSTRUCTOR CHARACTERISTICS AND JOB-RELATED ACTIVITIES ON TEACHER/STUDENT RELATIONSHIPS IN TWO DIPLOMA NURSING PROGRAMS

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED MASTER OF EDUCATION

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED 1982

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(Signed) Marie L. Middleton

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

11732 - 39 A Avenue
EDMONTON, Alberta
T6J OP2

DATED April 23, 1982

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled THE EFFECT OF INSTRUCTOR CHARACTERISTICS AND JOB-RELATED ACTIVITIES ON TEACHER/STUDENT RELATIONSHIPS IN TWO DIPLOMA NURSING PROGRAMS submitted by Marie L. Middleton in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education.

Konrad
Supervisor

R. Bryce

Amy E. Zelmer

Date April 23, 1982

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to identify perceptions of nurse educators in two Alberta Diploma Schools of Nursing regarding the personal and professional characteristics and instructional and non-instructional activities which facilitate or detract from the teacher/student relationship.

Data were collected using a questionnaire comprised of four sections related to: (1) personal and professional data; (2) personal and professional characteristics of teacher; (3) instructional related activities; and (4) non-instructional activities. Prior to being used in the major investigation, the questionnaire was subjected to a pilot study and revised. All data from the 43 completed and returned questionnaires was analyzed.

Data were analyzed using frequency and percentage distribtuions to describe the personnal and professional data; ranking of items by means was performed to identify both the facilitator profile and detractor profile; t-test and one-way analysis of variance procedures were used to determine differences in perceptions of respondents regarding the importance of personal and professional characteristics, instructional and non-instructional activities as facilitators and detractors; t-test and one-way analysis of variance procedures were performed to identify differences in perceptions of respondents regarding discrepancies between facilitators and detractors and importance of personal and professional characteristics, instructional and non-instructional activities.

Analysis of the data revealed that nurse educators perceived the personal and professional characteristics considered most important in facilitating the teacher/student relationship to be: demonstrates skills, attitudes and values to be developed by the student; concern for each student as a person; and welcomes and respects differences of opinion. Personal and professional characteristics were generally considered, by the respondents, to be facilitators. The nurse educators perceived size of group in clinical instruction and size of classes in classroom instruction, which appeared in the area of instructional activities, to both, facilitate and detract equally from the teacher/student relationship. The respondents considered the non-instructional activities of time spent establishing rapport with staff in clinical area, preparing for clinical assignments and communicating with supervisory personnel to have the most important facilitating effect on the teacher/student relationship. The non-instructional activities, perceived by the nurse educators, to detract from the relationship to the greatest extent were: time spent on clerical activities, faculty committee work and faculty meetings. Nurse educators generally did not perceive non-instructional activities to have a facilitating effect on the teacher/student relationship.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to extend sincere gratitude to Dr. A. G. Konrad, thesis advisor, for his guidance, encouragement and assistance during the development of this study and preparation of the thesis.

The advice received from the members of the thesis committee, Dr. R.C. Bryce and Dr. A.E. Zelmer is greatly appreciated.

Special thanks to Mrs. Chris Prokop for her assistance in the preparation of the computer programs used in the data analysis.

Appreciation is extended to Grant MacEwan Community College and the author's colleagues in the Health Sciences Department for the support and encouragement during the various phases of the study.

Special thanks are extended to Debra Geisler for typing the manuscript drafts and this completed thesis.

The author wishes to acknowledge all the nurse educators who so kindly assisted and participated in this study.

Finally, the author wishes to extend deepest gratitude to her husband Dennis and sons Garry and Scott for their continued support and patience during the writing of this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT PAGE

CHAPTER

I. STATEMENT OF PROBLEM AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE 1
  Introduction 1
  The Problem 4
  Importance Of The Study 5
  Definition Of Terms 6
  Assumptions, Limitations And Delimitations . . . 7
    Assumptions 7
    Limitations 8
    Delimitations 8
  Organization Of The Thesis 8
II. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH . . 10
  Facilitative Relationships And Career Choice. . 10
  Humanism And Humanistic Education 12
  Characteristics Of A Humanistic Environment . . 14
    Communication 14
    Educational climate 17
    Classroom environment 17
    Clinical practice environment 20
    Teacher characteristics determined by evaluations 23
    Role Model 27

CHAPTER PAGE

Teacher Roles: Tasks And Activities 31
Instuctional activities 32
Non-instuctional activities 33
Professional role versus academic role . . 36
Teachers role and accountability 37
Summary 39
III. INSTRUMENTATION AND METHODOLOGY 41
Instrumentation 41
Choice of instrumentation 41
Development of the instrument 42
Validation of the instrument 43
The instrument 44
Methodology 45
Data collection procedure 45
Data Analysis 48
Summary 50
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA AND DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS 51
Personal And Professional Data Profile 51
Facilitators And Detractors Of Teacher/Student Relationship 56
Sub-problem 1 57
Sub-problem 2 59
Sub-problem 3 62
Sub-problem 4 64
Sub-problem 5 66
Sub-problem 6 68

CHAPTER PAGE

Overall Level Of Importance Of Facilitator Profile 70

Overall Level Of Importance Of Detractor Profile 75

Sub-problem 7 80

Personal And Professional Data As Facilitators . 81

Personal And Professional Data As Detractors . . 96

Discrepancy Of Items Between Facilitators And Detractors 108

Sub-problem 8 111

Comments On The Study 121

Summary 127

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS 128

Summary 128

Conclusions 141

Implications 142

BIBLIOGRAPHY 146

APPENDICES 154

APPENDIX A QUESTIONNAIRE 156

APPENDIX B CORRESPONDENCE 162

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

1. Distribution And Return Of Questionnaires . . . 49

2. Frequency And Percentage Distributions For Personal And Professional Data 52

3. Means and Rank Order of Means of Responses on Importance of Personal and Professional Characteristics to Facilitating Teacher/Student Relationship 58

4. Means and Rank Order of Means of Responses on Extent to Which Personal and Professional Characteristics Detract From Teacher/Student Relationship 61

5. Means and Rank Order of Means of Responses on Importance of Instructional Related Activities to Facilitating Teacher/Student Relationship 63

6. Means and Rank Order of Means of Responses on Extent to Which Instructional Related Activities Detract From Teacher/Student Relationship 65

7. Means and Rank Order of Means of Responses on Importance of Non-Instructional Activities to Facilitating Teacher/Student Relationship 67

8. Means and Rank Order of Means of Responses on Extent to Which Non-Instructional Activities Detract From Teacher/Student Relationship 69

9. Means and Rank Order of Means of Responses Overall Importance of Items to Facilitating Teacher/Student Relationship 71

10. Means and Rank Order of Means of Responses Overall Extent That Items Detract From Teacher/Student Relationship 76

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

TABLE PAGE

11. One-Way Analysis Of Variance Of Importance Of Items To Facilitating Teacher/Student Relationship On Basis Of Age 82

12. One-Way Analysis Of Variance Of Importance Of Items To Facilitating Teacher/Student Relationship On Basis Of Areas Of Major Teaching Responsibilities 84

13. One-Way Analysis Of Variance Of Importance Of Items To Facilitating Teacher/Student Relationship On Basis Of Amount Of Nursing Prior To Teaching Experience 85

14. One-Way Analysis Of Variance Of Importance Of Items To Facilitating Teacher/Student Relationship On Basis Of Amount Of Teaching Experience In Nursing Education 87

15. One-Way Analysis Of Variance Of Importance Of Items To Facilitating Teacher/Student Relationship On Basis Of Length Of Present Employment 89

16. T-Test Comparison Of Importance Of Items To Facilitating Teacher/Student Relationship On Basis Of Program 92

17. T-Test Comparison Of Importance Of Items To Facilitating Teacher/Student Relationship On Basis Of Education 94

18. T-Test Comparison Of Importance Of Items To Facilitating Teacher/Student Relationship On Basis Of Status Of Employment 95

19. T-Test Comparison Of Importance Of Items Facilitating Teacher/Student Relationship On Basis Of Extent Of Employment 97

20. One-Way Analysis of Variance of Items to Detracting From Teacher/Student Relationship on Basis of Age 98

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

TABLE PAGE

21. One-Way Analysis of Variance of Items to Detracting From Teacher/Student Relationship on Basis of Areas of Major Teaching Responsibilities 100

22. One-Way Analysis of Variance of Items to Detracting From Teacher/Student Relationship on Basis of Amount of Nursing Prior to Teaching Experience 102

23. One-Way Analysis of Variance of Items to Detracting From Teacher/Student Relationship on Basis of Amount of Teaching Experience in Nursing Education 104

24. One-Way Analysis of Variance of Items to Detracting From Teacher/Student Relationship on Basis of Length of Present Employment. . 106

25. T Test Comparison of Importance of Items to Detracting From Teacher/Student Relationship on Basis of Program 107

26. T Test Comparison of Items Detracting From Teacher/Student Relationship on Basis of Status of Employment 109

27. T Test Comparison of Items Detracting From Teacher/Student Relationship on Basis of Extent of Employment 110

28. One-Way Analysis of Variance of Discrepancy of Items Between Facilitators and Detractors on Basis of Age (F-D) 112

29. One-Way Analysis of Variance of Discrepancy of Items Between Facilitators and Detractors on Basis of Areas of Major Teaching Responsibilities (F-D) 115

30. One-Way Analysis of Variance of Discrepancy of Items Between Facilitators and Detractors on Basis of Amount of Nursing Work Prior to Teaching Experience (F-D) 117

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

TABLE PAGE

31. One-Way Analysis of Variance of Discrepancy of Items Between Facilitators and Detractors on Basis of Teaching Experience in Nursing Education (F-D) 118

32. One-Way Analysis of Variance of Discrepancy of Items Between Facilitators and Detractors on Basis of Length of Present Employment (F-D) . 120

33. T Test Comparison of Discrepancy of Items Between Facilitators and Detractors on Basis of Program (F-D) 122

34. T Test Comparison of Discrepancy of Items Between Facilitators and Detractors on Basis of Education (F-D) 123

CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE

INTRODUCTION

Society today is demanding accountability from persons employed in social institutions. Professional associations, including nursing and education, are also demanding accountability from their members. Poulin (1977) states that nurses are accountable to the clients they serve. It might also be said that teachers are accountable to the students they serve. Nurse educators, however, have a dual role, that of a nurse and an educator. One might, therefore, correctly assume that the nurse educator is accountable to two groups of clients: the student and the patient. Williamson (1967:82) points out: "The instructor cannot act as primary initiator of nursing practice; he guides the student to think through and initiate patient care." Nurses today are becoming more concerned with accountability to their clients, in addition to the quantity and quality of their care. It is also true that nurse educators are concerned with both accountability to their students as well as the quantity and quality of time spent with their students.

One of the functions of social institutions is the aspect of caring. Funk and Wagnalls Dictionary defines caring as: "To have or show regard, interest or concern." In order for caring to be operationalized, some interaction must occur between the provider and recipient.

Another aspect of social institutions is that of helping. Helping people has been the foundation of nursing. Nurse educators focus their helping relationships upon the student (Clark, 1978). This same relationship is no doubt evident in the educational scene -- teachers helping students to learn.

In order for a facilitative interaction of caring and helping to occur, job satisfaction must be present. What then constitutes job satisfaction for the nurse educator who has this dual role of nurse and educator?

In Nursing Manpower, a study commissioned by the Alberta Hospitals Association (1980), Alberta nurses ranked personal feelings of accomplishment as most important to general job satisfaction. This item related to the paired factors of "achievement/self-fulfillment and patient care." Alberta nurse educators identified working with students as one of the most important facets leading to job satisfaction (Davis, 1980). According to Sergiovanni (1967:77)

> Teachers tend to focus on psychic gratifications as a primary source of reward in their work. One of the major sources of psychic gratification is the interaction the teacher has with individual students and classes.

It appears then, that good relationships with clients/ students serves as a primary reward in the work place for both nurses and teachers. Different aspects of the teacher/

student relationship have been researched in school systems and educational programs (Ashley and LaBelle, 1967; Sergiovanni, 1967; Wittmer and Myrick, 1974). It seems, however, that relatively little attention has been devoted to the specific topic of the teacher/student relationship in nursing education.

Recent literature suggests humanism and/or humanistic psychology must be emphasized in the social institution in order for facilitative relationships to develop. There is growing evidence that humanism is being incorporated into both the nursing profession and educational setting (Bernard and Huckins, 1974; Bower, 1977; Clark, 1978). In their unique dual role, nurse educators must emphasize humanism equally in the classroom and clinical practice setting. The work environment, be it the classroom or clinical practice setting, must provide job satisfaction in order for this facilitative relationship to be maximized.

Recent Alberta studies (A.H.A., 1980; Davis, 1980) indicated job dissatisfaction occurs when other related job tasks interfere with the most important facet of the job, interaction between nurse/nurse educator and the client/student. To date the literature regarding studies examining the manner in which related job activities affect the primary source of job satisfaction, the teacher/student relattionship is sparse. A study involving nurse educators concerning the manner in which activities of their job affect the teacher/student relationship would be an appropriate endeavor.

THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this study was to identify perceptions of nurse educators in two Alberta Diploma Schools of Nursing regarding the personal and professional characteristics and instructional and non-instructional activities which facilitate or detract from the teacher/student relationship.

Several sub-problems emerged from the basic problem.

1. What personal and professional characteristics do nurse educators perceive as facilitating teacher/student relationship?

2. Which personal and professional characteristics are perceived by nurse educators as detracting from the teacher/student relationship?

3. What facets of instructional activities of nursing education are perceived as facilitating the teacher/student relationship?

4. What facets of instructional activities of nursing education are perceived as detracting from the teacher/student relationship?

5. Which tasks of the non-instructional activities in nursing education are perceived as facilitating the teacher/student relationship?

6. Which tasks of the non-instructional activities in nursing education are perceived as detracting from the teacher/student relationship?

7. To what extent do personal and professional variables of age, teaching, experience, general nursing experi-

ence prior to teaching, educational preparation, and place, extent and status of employment affect perceptions of respondents regarding the facilitators and detractors in the teacher/student relationship?

8. To what degree do the respondents perceive a discrepancy of personal and professional characteristics and instructional and non-instructional activities as facilitators and detractors to the teacher/student relationship?

IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

The study should have value in that it will add to the rather limited amount of research on the effect of job-related activities to the teacher/student relationships in nursing education. The information should be of interest to those concerned with the "helping" relationship of the teacher with her students as it relates to students growth and performance in their chosen career. Nurses in Alberta have recently expressed the following specific concerns regarding their profession, "I would instill within all nurses a more empathetic attitude" and "Instill compassion and caring into the 'new generation'." (A.H.A., 1980:134). Clark (1978:22) states the "qualities of caring need to become part of the educational climate in which nurses learn."

At this time in history, nurse educators are being challenged to be accountable. The student is the product of their endeavors and it is by the student's behavior in the work environment that the educator is being judged. Clark

(1978:22) believes that "since nursing is a helping profession, the educational climate must be a humanizing one, students cannot be expected to be human with clients without role models for the helping relationships." It is the nurse educator who is held responsible to nurture this helping relationship in the students. Further, it is believed the nurturing can best be accomplished by a facilitative teacher/student relationship. Since nurse educators find this relationship a source of job satisfaction, the students will no doubt also benefit. This study should, therefore, be of interest to those nurse educators who believe that a helping relationship fostered between teacher/student will spill over to the student nurse/client relationship.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Nurse educators are defined as registered nurses who teach in a nursing education program in a variety of settings such as a hospital, college, or university. Although most nurse educators have a baccalaureate degree, there are those who may possess a certificate, a diploma or a master's degree.

Registered nurse is a nurse who is granted registration by the professional association.

Client refers to patient, group of patients, family or community (A.A.R.N., February 1981).

Student refers to male and female individuals engaged in learning in a program of studies. He/she, him/her shall be used interchangeably.

A.A.R.N. refers to the Alberta Association of Registered Nurses. In Alberta, the professional licensing body is the A.A.R.N.

A.H.A. refers to the Alberta Hospital Association.

Facet refers to some activity in the work situation of the nurse educator.

Facilitator refers to a situation or work-related activity which is perceived as enhancing the teacher/student relationship.

Detractor refers to a situation or work-related activity which is perceived as impeding the teacher/student relationship.

Instructional related activities refers to those facets of the work situation which directly affect the teaching-learning situation and usually involve student contact.

Non-Instructional activities refers to those facets of the work situation which indirectly affect the teaching-learning situation but does not involve student contact.

ASSUMPTIONS, LIMITATIONS AND DELIMITATIONS

Assumptions

1. It was assumed that the respondents would be motivated to answer the questionnaire, the selected research tool, and understood the intent of the questions.

2. It was assumed that the respondents were honest in their responses.

3. It was assumed that teachers demonstrating humanistic qualities developed warm, empathetic relationships with their students which contributed to their learning.

Limitations

1. The findings should be applied to the population being studied and inferences made to any other nurse educator population should be made with caution.

2. The questionnaire was limited to thirty-four data-gathering items.

3. The survey instrument did not allow the respondents to make a "don't-know" response to any section of the instrument.

Delimitations

This study was delimited in that

1. the survey was restricted to nurse educators in diploma programs offered in one college and one hospital school of nursing.

2. perceptions of teacher/student relationships held by students in the surveyed programs were not considered.

ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS

This chapter contained an introductory section describing the area of research. It also identified the problem, and the sub-problems which emerged from the basic problem. The importance of the study was then discussed followed by definition of terms. Finally, assumptions, limitations and delimitations of the study were outlined.

Chapter II presents a review of the literature and research in those areas which are related to the problem.

Chapter III discusses the development of the instrument. It also describes the sample selected to participate in the study. Further it deals with the methodology employed in collecting and analyzing the data.

The results of the responses and data analysis are discussed in Chapter IV.

A summary of findings, conclusions and implications of the study are contained in Chapter V, the final chapter.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

This chapter explores facilitative relationships, and the various components of the educational environment which are considered essential to developing these relationships. A brief examination of the importance of facilitative relationships and career choice is included in the first section. The factors of humanism and humanistic education, characteristics of a humanistic environment and the effective teacher which contribute to a facilitative teacher/ student relationship are also discussed.

FACILITATIVE RELATIONSHIPS AND CAREER CHOICE

Interpersonal relationships, an aspect of humanistic education, are viewed as crucial to the helping professions such as teaching and nursing. When students are questioned as to why they have chosen to be a teacher, inevitably responses include statements such as: a desire to help people, a desire to be of service to others and a sense of personal fulfillment (Altman, cited in Morrison and McIntyre 1963).

Bernard and Huckins (1974:54) state:

> The real, basic down-to-earth reason for teaching is because the human interaction opportunities it pro-

> vides to do something for the self-realization and growth of the teacher. Teachers teach because they hope to get something for themselves from the experience.

These and other such responses are similar to those given by students entering the nursing profession. It becomes clear, then, that relationships with others is of primary concern when embarking on a career of teaching or nursing.

Although many studies abound regarding the students' perceptions of the teacher-student interaction, it is only recently that interest in the teacher's response to this relationship is growing. Several studies have shown that many of the immediate satisfactions of teaching result from meaningful contacts with students.

The classroom is considered the workplace of the teacher and students. Educators who create humanizing classroom environments facilitate the helping relationship, as well as stimulate learning. Students cannot be expected to demonstrate caring without role models for this helping relationship and an environment in which to practice this concept.

The nurse educator's role, according to Williamson (1976), has been much maligned. She is often accused of abdicating her practitioner role. In addition, teaching loads are high while these educators are also responsible for clinical supervision (both time consuming and frequently frustrating). The clinical facility often places extra demands on the nurse educator.

Sergiovanni (1967:103-104) states that "the job of teacher requires considerable attention to maintainance type activity . . . that leads to dissatisfaction." Herzberg, Mausner, and Synderman (1959:48) believe that "the actual doing of the job or tasks of the job are sources of good or bad feelings about it." The contact with students is one of the most rewarding aspects of the job as perceived by school teachers and nurse educators. Satisfaction factors, therefore, tend to focus on humanism and teacher/student relationships. Dissatisfaction factors appear to focus on tasks and activities which interfere or have disrupting effects on this relationship.

HUMANISM AND HUMANISTIC EDUCATION

Facilitative relationships are fostered by both humanism and a humanistic philosophy. Within the last decade much has been written about humanistic education, the teacher as a helper and helping relationships (Bernard and Huckins, 1974; Bossert, 1979; Brophy & Good, 1974; Wittmer & Myrick, 1974).

"Third Force psychology focuses upon the individual, seeing him as a growing, dynamic organism in the process of becoming, constantly striving for self-fulfillment" (Pugh 1976:50). However, Brown (1971:3) discusses "Confluent education" as "the integration or flowing together of the affective and cognitive elements in individual and group learning - sometimes called humanistic or psychological education." Since the emergence of "Third Force" or humanistic psychology, more emphasis has been placed on attempts to humanize education. Stanford and Roark (1974:2) state:

> Our position rests on three basic principles, which should serve as the foundation for any attempts to humanize education: education is a social process, significant learning occurs through human interaction, and education must include self-knowledge and self understanding.

Creating a humane atmosphere has been the concern of teachers (and administrators) for many years. However, it is generally the teacher who is responsible for setting the mood for learning in the classroom. Archer (1973:2) states, "A humane atmosphere allows development of the individual, his dignity and self concept through the academics." Brophy & Good (1974:27) believe that:

> Teaching means more than simply transmitting information and skills to nameless and faceless learners; it also involves personal, one-to-one relationships with each student. By continually observing and interacting with their students, teachers become very familiar with both their general personalities and their specific characteristics as learners.

Regardless how each author defines or defends humanism, humanistic education, or facilitative teaching, it becomes apparent that a positive interaction must occur between teacher and students in order for a humane atmosphere to be created. Further, there appears to be support from the literature that teachers must be concerned with both cognitive and affective elements in the individual. Flanders (1970:269) identifies these elements as follows: "Cognitions consist of thoughts in our heads and affective sensations are said to be emotions we feel." He elaborates further:

"Teachers and pupils think about their feelings and often feel strongly about their thoughts" (p. 269) and ". . . every pattern of interaction has a cognitive and an affective component. To understand what goes on in the classroom is to take both into consideration" (p. 270). It becomes clear that thoughts and feelings of both teacher and students must be considered if humanistic education is to be a reality.

There appears to be agreement that the teacher is responsible for creating a humanistic classroom environment. There also appears to be agreement that a humane atmosphere is desirable from the standpoint of both teacher and students.

CHARACTERISTICS OF A HUMANISTIC ENVIRONMENT

Much has been written about the learning environment in which teachers and students find themselves. Communication and the educational climate are two characteristics which appear to greatly affect teacher/student interaction in the learning environment. This environment has been described as that which either facilitates or creates barriers to teacher/student relationships and ultimately to the learning process. Degrees between these contrasts are also discussed in the literature.

Communication

Education may be considered to be a social interaction. Teachers talk and (it is presumed) students listen. Hoy, cited in Morrison and McIntyre (1973:160), states:

> Humanistic orientations . . . conceive of the school as an educational community in which students learn through cooperative interaction and experience . . . self-discipline is substituted for strict teacher control. Humanistic orientations lead teachers to desire a democratic atmosphere with open channels of two-way communication between pupils and teachers and increased self determination.

Pine and Boy (1977:10) believe that "communication between teacher and students is expressed through affective, cognitive, verbal and non-verbal means." Teachers must also be cognizant that they teach not only by what they say but also what they are and do.

Effective communication is considered to be necessary for effective interpersonal relationships and consequently for learning to be enhanced. Archer (1976:2) believes that "Effective communication between the students and teachers, amongst students and teachers is a primary prerequisite in creating an atmosphere of free exchange and a learning environment." He goes on to say that "if students are to be successful and productive, genuine rapport should be established initially" (p. 3). Paduano (1975:20) says "Spend those first few class hours really getting to know each other." Henson & Henry (1976:83) believe that "the process of teaching involves the successful interaction between the teacher and students." It seems, therefore, that establishing rapport early in the teaching-learning process is vital, if effective teacher-student interaction is to occur.

Considerable research has been conducted regarding this interaction. Flanders (1970:33) developed a ten category system entitled "Flanders Interaction Analysis Categories" which has been utilized by many researchers to determine teacher-student interaction. He felt that as "far as communication is concerned, three conditions, (a) teacher talk, (b) pupil talk, and (c) silence or confusion, are said to exhaust all the possibilities." The use of this classification system allows an observer to estimate the percent time of interaction in each of the three conditions. Flanders (1970:35) states, "The major feature of this category system has in the analysis of initiative and response which is a characteristic of interaction between two or more individuals." The reader must be cautioned, however, that the quality of the statements must also be considered and may very well not be documented when using this interaction tool.

Stuebbe (1980:9), while she was a senior nursing student, conducted a student survey and found that:

> Increased communication between instructors and students, as to what each of their own objectives are and how they view each other's roles, is mandatory in order to facilitate increased understanding and working together to reach common goals.

Pugh (1976:55) indicates that:

> Communication is facilitated if the social distance between teacher and learner is reduced and mutual respect is maintained. As each participant is able to trust the other, both of them are able to trust the other, both of them are able to truly be themselves and to enter into sensitive and open interaction which reveals their needs within the learning situation.

Communication, in a classroom, that occurs between individuals, groups of pupils, or the entire class, is also seen as vital to creating a humanistic environment. Communication is, therefore, more than merely talking and listening. Both the affective and cognitive elements, as well as verbal and non-verbal means of interaction, must be taken into account. In addition, the quality of the communciation also adds to the effectiveness of the interaction. When communication occurs in an atmosphere of trust, the affective goals of both teacher and learner are more likely to be achieved.

Educational Climate

As stated previously, the classroom is considered to be the workplace of teachers and students. It has been stated that the teacher is generally considered to be responsible for the climate of the learning environment. The nurse educator, however, finds she is responsible to create a humane atmosphere in two learning environments -- the classroom and the clinical practice setting.

Classroom Environment

Teachers who embrace humanistic education, believe it is the teacher's responsibility to create an atmosphere of warmth, trust and openness in the classroom. Gorman (1974:x), in Teachers and Learners, discusses "setting the classroom stage" for student learning. He believes that "this stage setting should create a readiness for teaching and learning by reducing the social distance between teacher and student while maintaining mutual respect." Reducing the social distance does not imply that the teacher abdicates his role, but rather, it sets the stage where students feel the teacher is more approachable. Pine and Boy (1977:8) believe the humanistic teacher is a "learner-centered teacher" who "works to develop a positive, humanizing and psychologically nourishing climate."

Nursing students, like other students today, also reject a cold, impersonal learning environment. They, too, are demanding a more "human" atmosphere. Paduano (1975:21) states that many nursing students found that a "relaxed atmosphere and informal teacher-student relationship resulted in a more mature approach to their learning needs."

It is believed that a humanistic environment allows for effective interaction between teachers and students. The process of teaching is facilitated by this effective interaction, and, therefore, learning should also be facilitated. Henson and Henry (1976:68) state:

> The results of teacher-pupil interaction in the classrooms are as real as the outcomes from formal academic study. Although the teacher is affected by his perception of the class and its collective behavior, he is in the better position to manipulate the environment so that certain types of behaviors, feelings, and attitudes have a good opportunity to emerge.

The various authors who are proponents of humanistic education believe that an affective or humanizing environment is one that is characterized by an atmosphere which contains the qualities of empathy, warmth, concern and understanding. Busl (1981:43) states:

> A favorable atmosphere for learning will be present if the teacher makes himself available to students, is responsive to the students' learning needs, values and respects the learner, and minimizes the inhibiting effects of emotions in learning.

It is generally agreed, by various authors, that it is the teacher who sets the "tone" for the classroom. Furthermore, classroom management is one of the vital factors in the role of teacher. Some educators have been of the opinion that structuring the learning environment to provide for an optimum emotional-educational climate is difficult. Other educators believe that creating a humanizing environment is the teachers's responsibility and is readily attained. In addition, beneficial affects such as making teaching and learning interesting and enjoyable are incurred when the classroom environment is a humanistic one.

Busl (1981:43) indicates that:

> The teacher has a great influence on the learning environment. His attitude towards the students is extremely important; he will usually get the kind of behavior from the students that he expects.

In order for the helping relationship to be nurtured in students, in addition to establishing effective teacher-student interaction, the teacher has the responsibility to set a classroom stage which is pleasant and comfortable. The atmosphere in this work environment of teacher and students should also contain those identified qualities in which teacher-student benefits are enhanced and barriers are diminished or eliminated.

Clinical Practice Environment

Nurse educators must be concerned not only with the classroom environment but also with the clinical practice setting. It is in this setting that student nurses are socialized into the role of the nurse. Cotanch (1981:6) indicates, "For proper socialization to occur a positive relationship must exist between faculty and hospital nursing personnel and nursing students." The nurse educator must, therefore, attempt to create a humanistic environment in the clinical practice setting since it is here where the students, according to Meleca et al (1981:33), "acquire the kinds of professional and personal skills, attitudes and behaviors thought essential for entering the health care system."

Studies have shown that the clinical practice setting, the hospital, is the nursing student's most difficult adjustment. Wittmeyer and others cited in Williamson (1979) found that almost all of the attrition in students occurred after clinical courses started. A study conducted by student nurses (Garrett et al 1976:17) also found that clinical experiences provided the dominant theme for reports of stressful experiences by nursing students. Since the nurse educator is the primary link between the student nurse and the learning environment, the task of providing a clinical setting conducive to learning is considered to be her responsibility.

Barr (1980:49) writes:

> The teacher's role in the clinical setting is very much that of catalyst and she is involved in many interactions -- with staff, patients, students -- all with different responsibilities attached.

Stone and Berger (1978), however, state that an unfortunate separation of (nursing) service and education has occurred. They feel that nurse educators have taken the path of least resistance by assuming the posture of "guests" in the clinical setting. Also, as Mauksch (1980:23) states, "Hospital staff view nursing faculty as intruders and at best as guests in the clinical settings."

According to Mesolella (1970), the key factor responsible for the hostility which exists between nurse educators and nursing service personnel is "territory." The clinical practice setting is considered, by nursing service personnel, to be private territory, where the clinical instructor and her students are considered to be intruders. It is in this setting that nurse educators find it more difficult to provide an affective, humanizing environment. Ensuring a climate conducive to learning in the clinical setting is critical since, according to Williamson (1978:5-6), "there have been indications that the clinical experience influences success or failure in the nursing program to a greater extent than do other factors." It may be considered imperative, therefore, that the activity of establishing a humanizing clinical environment be a primary concern of the nurse educator.

According to Carter (1979:7-8), "An effective clinical learning experience requires the development of sound working relationships between head nurse, staff and the nurse educator." To work towards establishing an effective clinical learning environment, the nurse educator has a responsibility to orient all levels of staff to the school philosophy, course objectives, student objectives and expectations of student needs. She must also become oriented to the agency, unit, and staff in order to be perceived more as a competent nursing colleague rather than a guest or intruder. The nurse educator and head nurse, together, should meet with unit staff to discuss the goals of student experience and the roles they are expected to play. This information sharing is necessary since clinical teaching reflects the values of the educational institution, faculty and students, as well as those of the staff and agency providing clinical experience for the students.

The unit staff is vital to the learning experiences of the student since the "learning laboratory is significantly different from that created by the busy teacher in an active inward who dashes from one neophyte to another as each is involved in clinical activities for the first time" (Smith, 1976:86). It is believed that a positive relationship with the agency staff, results in a group of nurses eager to assist the learning process as well as to insure a climate conducive to learning. As Little and Carnevalli, cited in Carter (1979:9), point out:

> . . . the staff with whom the students will work

> and who directly influence the quality and quantity of the learning experiences to be obtained must trust the nurse educator and want to facilitate the goals held for the students.

Positive relationships develop through open communication, shared interest (in students and patients), trust, informal socialization, and mutual respect for the contributions which both nursing education and nursing service bring to the profession of nursing. Carter (1979:9) believes that:

> Role modeling of the relationship between nursing education and service is inspiring to students and provides them with the foundation they need to become socialized into the professional role of the nurse.

Students believe that the nurse educator's major concern and efforts should go into teaching. It is often forgotten by unit staff that the student is not a nurse but rather is learning to become a nurse. Therefore, creating an affective climate in the clinical practice setting to enhance students' learning and decrease stressful factors must then certainly be a major concern and responsibility of the nurse educator.

Facilitative characteristics of the teacher are believed to contribute to an effective teacher-student interaction. In addition, it appears to be the opinion of various authors that the nurse-educator demonstrates caring qualities and is therefore considered to be a role model to student nurses.

Teacher Characteristics Determined by Evaluations

What makes a good instructor? This is an age-old question which has been researched extensively. Jackson (1977:9) states:

> Students want to evaluate, many are demanding to evaluate the faculty and education environment in which they are involved. They believe their opinions are worthwhile and of value in the improvement of education.

DeTornyay (1977:188) believes that "Students have taken the rhetoric of democracy seriously and are insistent on becoming partners in the educational endeavor."

Students, in fact, have long been involved in teacher evaluation. Flanders & Nuthall (1972:431) cite a 1936 study done by Hart polling the opinions of 10,000 students, regarding the characteristics which discriminated the best liked from least liked teachers. The following characteristics identified the best liked teachers:

1. teaching skill (clear explanations, use of examples etc.)
2. cheerful, good natured, patient, not irritable.
3. friendly, companionable, not aloof.
4. interested in pupils, understands them.
5. impartial -- does not have "teacher pets".
6. fair in grading and marking.

Hart found this list was typical of those obtained in other studies. A 1929 study, also cited in Flanders and Nuthall (1972:432), lists the following six traits which were identified when researchers asked the views of experts (i.e., school administrators, professors of education and others)

1. adaptability
2. consideration
3. enthusiasm
4. good judgement
5. honesty
6. magnetism

Evans, cited in Morrison and McIntyre (1973:130), summarized the results of studies regarding students' preferences of teacher characteristics as follows:

> Children like teachers who are kind, friendly, cheerful, patient, helpful, fair, have a sense of humor, show an understanding of children's problems . . . They dislike teachers who use sarcasm, ridicule . . . fail to provide for the needs of individual pupils. . .

Nursing students have also identified characteristics of effective teachers. Rauen (1974) conducted a study in which data were collected from freshman and senior students in three diploma programs in the Milwaukee, Winsconsin area. The data tool selected was "Clinical Instructor Characteristics Ranking Scale" (CICRS). The findings of this study revealed that the nurse role characteristics were significantly more important than either person role or teacher role characteristics. Senior students indicated the "nurse" role characteristic of demonstrating the ability to function in a real nursing situation was most important while freshman students considered the giving of quality patient care enthusiastically of primary importance.

In another study utilizing the CICRS scale, Stuebbe (1980:9) found that "students value the learning of observed nursing skills and theory most, while instructors valued teacher-student relationships more." Kiker (1973:721) found that students perceptions and evaluations of their teachers indicated that:

> Among the characteristics identified as important are professional competence, positive personal relationships, ability to identify principles, availability

of instructors to students, consideration of students time.

It appears that nurse educators, unlike teachers in a school system, are evaluated in two areas. Student nurses desire to evaluate the instructor on her nursing abilities as well as the teacher qualities.

Brown (1981) found that although much research had been conducted on characteristics the effective classroom teacher should possess, the literature was relatively sparse with regard to studies conducted on characteristics of clinical teachers. Brown, therefore, conducted a study to identify those characteristics of the clinical teacher believed to be important by both faculty and students. Her "Clinical Teachers Characteristics Instrument" was used in surveying both students and faculty members. It was found that both groups (students and faculty) unanimously identified the following characteristics as important:

1. Conveys confidence in and respect for the student.
2. Is well informed and able to communicate knowledge to students.
3. Supervises and helps in new experiences without taking over.
4. Provides useful feedback on student progress.
5. Is realistic in expectations of students.
6. Is honest and direct with students.
7. Encourages students to feel free to ask questions or to ask for help.
8. Is objective and fair in the evaluation of the student.
9. Is flexible when the occasion calls for it.

Literature supports a variety of terms describing the effective or essential characteristics of a teacher. It is of interest to note however, that there appears to be consensus in both general and nursing education, that humanisttic qualities such as warmth, understanding, respect for student, honesty, etc. are desirable qualities for the instructor to possess. In addition, students indicate that accessibility and approachability to the instructor is important.

Faculty or "peer" evaluation tools contain the same general characteristics as do those research instruments for surveying students. Characteristics such as, willingness of instructor to help, genuine interest in student progress, openess to others' viewpoints, classroom climate conducive to learning, availability to assist students, etc. (Nash, 1977; Kinsey, 1981; and others) are apparently of as much concern for faculty as they are for students.

Regardless of which population was surveyed, (regarding teacher characteristics) there seemed to be a consensus that humanistic qualities are valued by students, teachers and experts in education. Identifying teacher characteristics which enhance learning and foster a humane classroom environment has merit for teachers and students alike.

Role Model

Nursing, as well as teaching, is viewed as a helping profession where clients also benefit from the relationships established. The quality of caring is viewed as an essential element in the helping relationship.

Adam (1980:49) states, "The helping relationship is not . . . something that is unique to nursing . . . . It is, however, essential for effective nursing care." Nursing curricula stresses the importance of a positive relationship between a nurse and patient. La Monica and Karshmer (1978) point out that very little nursing literature addresses itself to how or when the qualities of the helping relationship are learned and developed in curricula, or maintained in nursing practice. Hall and Mitsunaga (1979:19) found that:

> . . . there are no actual research data that indicate a good relationship leads to good care . . . the assumption that connects good relationships to good care is largely an untested hypothesis of the nursing profession.

How students develop a caring attitude has long been a topic of concern for nurse educators. Teachers are generally considered to be role models for their students and, as such, should demonstrate those qualities which they desire of their students. Bandura and McDonald, cited in Durrant (1978), tested the hypothesis that subjects would learn to imitate behavior exhibited by an experimenter-model and that "nuturant" (i.e., rewarding, warm) interaction between model and learner would enhance this imitative learning. Research confirmed their hypothesis. Other studies cited in Durrant (1978:18) indicate that "the presence of certain characteristics were found to be necessary to the 'successful' model teacher-student relationship."

Carkhuff, cited in LaMonica and Karshmer (1978), describes the primary characteristics in a helping relationship as empathy, respect, warmth, genuiness, self-disclosure, concreteness and immediacy of relationship. Adam (1980) lists empathy, respect, authenticity, specificity, confrontation and immediacy as the necessary attitudes for helping others. Pine and Boy (1977) would add mutual trust, concern, listening, compassion and honesty to the list of desirable attitudes. Pine and Boy (1977:26) also state:

> Teacher educators need to pay more attention to the dimension of personal growth. Students tend to model their teaching behaviors and attitudes on their interactions with and observations of professors and supervisors. The professor or supervisor who is growing and learning, who trusts his students and is real with them, who listens to students and confronts them in facilitative ways "teaches" humanism.

The literature regarding nursing instructor and student relationships also supports the premise of the role model phenomenon. According to Jones and Jones (1977), Stuebbe, (1980), and others, student nurses report that the instructor, especially the instructor encountered early in the program, is the most influential source as role model. Mesolella (1974:15) says:

> By being caring, open individuals with students, I believe we set an example of the behavior that will enable them to provide good nursing care . . . the teacher is a role model. She teaches effective interpersonal relationships by her own example with her students.

Scheideman, cited in Durrant (1978:17) and supported by Adam (1980), draws a parallel between the right of a patient as a consumer of health and the right of a student as a consumer of education.

> . . . nurses are often criticized for not finding time to draw up a chair by the patients bedside and listen to what he has to say. Similarily, nursing

> educators need to clear the cluttered schedules and provide times for "listening" that are distinct from teaching content.

Scheideman perceives that this practice of "listening" serves a double purpose: 1) to acquaint educators with student needs and thus enable them to do something about them, and 2) to allow educators to serve as role models. The demonstrating of the qualities of a helping relationship by the teacher appears to be essential in the role model phenomenon.

Other studies add that student nurses do not only model after nurse educators but also unit staff personnel. Mauksch (1980:21) believes that "nursing students have had to seek role models among nursing staff in the institutions where they affiliate rather than from among their teachers." The reason identified is that nurse educators were not perceived to be nurse practitioners despite the fact many of the clinical nursing faculty are also superbly prepared nurses. There is some indication according to Hicks and Westphal (1977) that student nurses, rather than selecting the nurse educator, view the head nurse as the major role model and other staff members as secondary role models. On the other hand, Cotanch (1981:6) cites the results of a 1974 study by Brown, Braders, and Oberman which found that "clinical instructors were seen as positive role models and staff nurses were seen as negative role models." Cotanch (1981:6) also cited Quint who found that the "nursing model of a therapeutic agent that exists between instructor-student-patient is often a theoretical rather than an actual model." A study conducted by Matarazzo and Weins, cited by Durrant (1978:18), would dispute Quint's findings. They asked, "Would a teacher 'caring' attitude be in turn reflected in a student nurse behavior vis-a-vis her patient?" Their findings, in fact, provided a positive answer to this query.

Although some literature indicates that nurse educators are not always the preferred role models, there seems to be consensus that they are the ones most likely to be chosen. The same is true for those students embarking on teaching careers; the preferred role models are their teachers/professors. The literature generally supports Durrant (1978:18) who says, "a key component for student acceptable performance is for the role model to model the behavior he/she wishes to see established as a norm in that student."

TEACHERS ROLES: TASKS AND ACTIVITIES

The teachers's central or primary role (responsibility) is related to instructional functions. However, numerous subroles or functions also compete for the time and energy of the individual teacher. Lortie, in Schoolteacher (1975:111), states, "Much of the teacher's role is defined by his position in the division of labor established by the school curriculum." Heidgerken (1965) identified three major role functions of the teacher, namely: instructional, faculty and individual. Ketefian (1977) identified subroles such as research, professional writing, involvement with professional organizations and service to community agencies. Williamson (1976) indicated that the nurse educator, in addition to teaching, must also be involved in various functions such as research, publications and public service. The teaching role itself often has both instructional and non-instructional activities associated with it. Students, the acknowledged consumers of the instructional process, believe that the teacher's time and energy should go into teaching them.

Instructional Activities

Bossert (1979:11) believes that "Classrooms themselves might be characterized by their distinctive utilization of instructional activities -- by their task organization." Heidgerken (1965) states activities such as planning and organizing courses, creating and maintaining a desirable climate (which will encourage and enhance learning), in addition to adaptive teaching and preparing and adopting instructional materials to the varying interests, needs and abilities of the students are a part of the instructional role of a teacher.

Edgerton (1977) vividly describes the teachers' numerous activities which she believes to be contradictory and in conflict with the primary role of teaching. She identifies a variety of instructional activities, such as paper grading, collecting late assignments, devising lesson plans, etc., as only a few of the numerous tasks and activities a teacher does throughout the day. Edgerton (1977:121) also believes that teachers develop "distinctly unpleasant personality characteristics" because of the role conflicts, for example, the executive, evaluative and counselor roles, a teacher encounters during the school day. Bossert (1979:11) states, "the organization of classroom tasks may influence the types of social relationships that develop between teacher and pupils and among pupils."

Research has documented that the teacher has the responsibility to create a warm, caring environment which facilitates teacher-student interaction and enhances learning. The teacher's instructional activities, however, often place her in the executive role of enforcing rules or evaluative role, where she not only evaluates academic performance but also "character development." This creates a conflict with the counselor role, which is perceived as supportive and advisory. The result is an environment which may in fact inhibit learning and effective interaction.

Non-Instructional Activities

There seems to be a consensus that non-instructional roles or activities (sometimes viewed as extraneous duties), clearly detract from the teacher's primary activity of teaching. This is shown by student comments such as "the instructor was not on the ward enough -- she had too many meetings to attend" (Telnes et al, 1966:54). Etzioni (1969:36) notes, "The teachers may participate (often voicing complaints) in committees which deal with school-wide matters . . ." Lortie (1975:65) reports, "Generally, teachers were not surprised at the nature of their tasks, with the one exception of clerical tasks . . ."

Many observational studies have been done on teacher roles. Flanders and Nuthall (1972:443) cite two of the most comprehensive studies undertaken in Great Britain (Hilsum & Crane, 1971; Duthie, 1970). Results of the Hilsum and Crane study showed that 4.76 hours per day were devoted to teaching and a substantial amount (42% of work done) to out-of-school work. The study also found that: (1) approximately one-quarter of school time was spent on non-professional activities, (2) that free periods became chore periods, and that (3) disruptions of classroom time occurred. The Duthie study found that teachers were involved in housekeeping and supervision duties sufficiently often and uniformly across grades to warrant the advocating of several auxilary programmes.

The concern with non-instructional activities interfering with or disrupting the class day is not unique only to teachers in the school system. Holliman (1977), a nurse educator, conducted an in-depth analysis of faculty members' workload at the school in which she was curriculum coordinator. The results of this study, which established an "Individual Teacher Workload Profile," indicated that of the 225 productive days available per year, 170 days were available for class/clinical preparation (C/C/P). When the total hours required for C/C/P were calculated, it was determined that the faculty member was overextended by 503 hours per year. Committee work, faculty meetings and attending workshops, etc. accounted for the discrepancy between productive days available and actual days available for C/C/P. Another nurse educator, Trautman (1977), in An Instructor's Diary, also identified similar non-instructional activities. These activities kept the teacher busy and were perceived as taking time away from student contact.

Miller and Rose (1975:8) suggest, "The instructor should discuss non-instructional responsibilites with administration in order that there will be a clear understanding of the expected role." Because of concerns expressed regarding the time spent on non-instructional activities, Barritt (1978:41-42) postulates several questions nurse educators should ask themselves, for example:

> - What if we held fewer committee meetings?
> - What if we limited our office hours to students in the same way that the rest of the university does, thus discouraging the constant availability syndrome?
> - What if we learned to feel less guilty about sitting and thinking instead of always doing?
> - What if we used non-nursing personnel more fully rather than feeling that every detail of nursing education, research, and service was the sole prerogative of the registered nurse?

Barritt also believes that "many times the overextension of faculty occurs because faculty members themselves have not been able to turn down students, colleagues, administration, or the public" (p. 42). Heidgerken (1965:200) suggests that "often, much time is wasted in nonlearning activities, such as dictating directions, when mimeographed material could be used just as satisfactorily." McPhail (1970:37) on the other hand, suggests the use of part-time teachers could effectively free the permanent teachers to "attend conferences and workshops, to take a leave of absence if necessary, and to work on committees."

Nurse educators, like teachers in the school system, appear to have a substantial amount of their time devoted to non-instructional activities. Since this fact concerns both groups of educators, studies have been done identifying all aspects of the teachers workload. Suggestions have been presented by some authors in an effort to relieve the teacher of some of those activities which detract from the primary activity of teaching.

Professional Role Versus Academic Role

Nurse educators, unlike other educators, have a dual role for which they must remain competent. This duality of roles often creates dissonance in the nurse educator.

Williamson (1976:82) states, "The nurse in academia carries an additional burden unknown to many disciplines . . . The professional role is the role that is identified, much more commonly than the academic role." Williamson also suggests another issue of concern to the nurse in academia, the need for all nurse educators to be licensed to practice nursing. Panicucci (1978:48) believes that "nursing faculty are becoming aware of the need to remain clinically competent in order to be effective teachers."

This indicates then that, in addition to the teaching responsibilities, some of the instructors' time should be devoted to developing and/or maintaining clinical competencies.

Teacher's Role and Accountability

Another factor which affects the educator's role is that of accountabilty. The nurse educator is professionally accountable to the client by preparing competent nurse practitioners (Kramer, 1976; Williamson, 1976). Student nurses often hold their teachers responsible for the education provided to them. Kramer (1976:115) stresses that:

> Probably the one group of nurses that has consistently attempted to hold nurse educators accountable for the products they prepare is nursing service employers.

Nurse educators, however, find they are not alone in being held accountable for the education provided to their students. In The New Teacher, Heath (1973:59) states, "Accountability simply means that the educator and school are responsible for the learner demonstrating measurable achievement following the educational experience."

Some aspects of the job for which they have little control are viewed, by the educators, to impede the teaching-learning process. Pine and Boy (1977:228), for example, are of the opinion that the demand of accountability for teacher performance is contingent upon "externally controlled prerogatives like pupil-teacher ratios, availability of special services, budgets for textbooks, and so on." The Coleman Report of 1966, cited in Heath (1973), which precipitated the movement toward accountability does not support this premise. The findings of this report determined that the crucial factors occurred in human interaction contexts, within authority relations among people. Other factors according to Coleman, such as the student's home environment, the social composition of the student body, and the quality of teachers (quality being contingent upon the relationship of teacher to learners) were considered to be the critical determinents of educational motivation and achievement. Although the teacher is held responsible for the students learning, he has little or no control over external factors such as home environment.

Nurse educators have similar concerns (such as faculty student ratios) when supervising students in the clinical agencies. The concern expressed by teachers regarding students home environment is not as critical to the nurse educator. However, the clinical agency environment over which the nurse educator often has little or no control is viewed as a crucial factor to the learning process. Fry (1975:6) paints the following scenario:

> The nurse-educator brings her students to floor X for their semester experience during which she encounters many unforseen difficulties. The head nurse pretends you are non-existent, and your requests fall on deaf ears. The staff are abrasive to your students and leap at the opportunity to point out a student's mistake. The head nurse becomes irate if the nursing tasks are not done on time. A judgmental attitude hangs in the air and your students are constantly scrutinized.

In spite of these difficulties, the nurse educator must still facilitate the learning process for which she is held accountable. Pugh (1976) suggests that nurse educators should, in fact, view their role as that of facilitator and helper rather than the old concept of teacher.

Regardless of all the factors which the teacher faces during the school day, according to numerous authors, the teacher is accountable to the students for creating a classroom (and clinical) environment in which they are encouraged to learn. Further, by re-examining the teacher role, Pugh (1976:57-58) believes, "Only then will we be able to courageously and optimistically interact with the learner in a rewarding relationship."

SUMMARY

In this chapter theoretical and research literature were reviewed in an attempt to provide and develop the background for the study. The literature suggested that humanism or humanistic psychology was important in establishing facilitative relationships in the educational setting. The helping relationship was considered to be equally important in both the school system and nursing education.

The literature also suggested the properties necessary to create a humane environment. The importance of "cognitive" and "affective" elements in education were also discussed.

Facets in the learning environment which either facilitated or created barriers in the development of supportive relationships between teachers and pupils, and consequently in the learning process, were identified and discussed. The literature also suggested that nurse educators are confronted with many of the factors confronting teachers in the school systems. Nurse educators, however, must be concerned with two areas in the learning environment: the classroom and clinical practice settings, each with their own unique characteristics.

The characteristics of a humanistic environment were extrapolated from the literature. An attempt was made to identify those characteristics which were considered to foster a humanistic environment. Also, the characteristics which were viewed as inhibiting the development of a humanistic environment were identified.

No evidence was found in the literature to support the hypothesis that good relationships lead to good care. However, the role-model concept was well documented in the nursing and general education literature.

The literature also seemed to indicate that student evaluation was an important factor in developing a humane environment. This includes student perceptions of which factors contributed to or detracted from a facilitative learning milieu. Accountability for the student's education was also reviewed, along with factors that enhance and detract from a teacher's responsibility.

CHAPTER III

INSTRUMENTATION AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter contains a description of the instrument used in this study and the methods employed to collect and analyze the data. The first section discusses the construction of a survey questionnaire. The remainder of the chapter deals with data collection procedure and analysis of the data.

INSTRUMENTATION

Choice of Instrumentation

A questionnaire was utilized to collect data for this study. Questionnaires are relatively inexpensive and less time consuming than other research methods, such as interview procedures or observation studies. Since the researcher is not present during the completion of the questionnaire, reseacher bias is eliminated and anonymity is assured. Also, because the questionnaire offers the best opportunity for anonymity it is believed that the information elicited is most likely to be accurate. The questionnaire, entitled Teacher/Student Relationship in Nursing Education, was developed for this study from information gathered from various sources.

Development Of The Instrument

The development of the research instrument for the purpose of collecting data involved the modification of questionnaires used in previous studies.

Section A of the questionnaire, designed for the purpose of collecting personal and professional data, was adapted from the Cadman (1977:150-151) instrument titled, "Evaluation of Nursing Instructors."

Items in Section B of the questionnaire, dealing with personal and professional characteristics of the teacher, were modified from various sources. Items 10 and 11 from the Richardson (1979:228) instrument titled, "Special Purpose Master's in Nursing Program For Alberta Nurse Educators." The Rogers (1972:139) instrument titled, "Teacher Evaluation Questionnaires for School Principals," provided items 12, 13, 14 and 15. Item 18 was obtained from Cadman (1977:154). The remainder of the items in this section were constructed from ideas obtained from the nursing literature.

Section C, titled Instructional Related Activities contains items 19-25 which were modifed from the Holdaway (1978:170-171) study titled, "Satisfaction of Teachers in Alberta With Their Work and Working Conditions." The last item in this section, #26, was constructed from the writer's personal experience in the instructional role.

The final section, Section D, relating to non-instructional activities, was also constructed from the writer's experience in the role of nurse educator, as well as experiences of colleagues which were obtained through discussion.

Validation Of The Instrument

In order to establish content and face validity the pilot questionnaire was distributed to five individuals with nursing backgrounds. These individuals were requested to review the questionnaire for clarity, format, content and length of time for completion. Four of the respondents were graduate students in the Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta and were nurse educators immediately prior to their student status. The fifth reveiwer was the Chairman, Health Sciences Department, Grant MacEwan Community College in Edmonton, Alberta.

The four graduate student respondents completed all sections of the questionnaire and in addition all respondents wrote comments regarding their reaction to the content, appropriateness of items, wording about direction provided and length of time for completion.

The Director - Nursing Education at the Royal Alexandra Hospital School of Nursing perused the pilot questionnaire and offered verbal comments regarding clarity, content and projected completion time. The pilot questionnaire was also reviewed by Dr. A.G. Konrad, the researcher's thesis advisor in the Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta.

Responses received from the reviewers resulted in minor revisions of the questionnaire. The items were generally considered to be appropriate, however, some minor modifications were made in directions provided to the respondents.

Placement of the response key was also changed on the basis of comments received. The length of time for completion varied from 15 to 20 minutes which was considered to be reasonable. After making the necessary changes a final draft of the questionnaire was constructed.

The Instrument

A copy of the final form of the questionnaire is included in Appendix A. The questionnaire is composed of four sections relating to: (1) personal and professional data; (2) personal and professional characteristics of teacher; (3) instructional related activities; and (4) non-instructional activities.

Section A, Personal and Professional Data, contains the following eight variables: type of program, age, highest level of education, status and extent of present employment, areas of major teaching responsibility, amount of nursing work prior to teaching, amount of teaching experience, and length of employment.

Section B, Teacher/Student Relationships includes items numbered 9 to 18 which identify personal and professional characteristics of the teacher. Respondents were asked to indicate their perceptions of the manner in which the identified characteristics affected the teacher/student relationships. Each item was rated two times on a Likert-type scale, as to its perceived importance in facilitating the relationships, and second as to the extent the characteristic detracted from the relationship. The following response keys were utilized:

Facilitates	Detracts
1. No importance	1. No extent
2. Some importance	2. Some extent
3. Moderate importance	3. Moderate extent
4. Great importance	4. Great extent
5. Very great importance	5. Very great extent

Section C, Instructional Related Activities, utilized the same response key. Items 19 through 26 identified items of the teaching-learning situation which generally involve students.

In Section D, Non-Instructional Activities, the same response key was again used. The items 27 through 34 included items which involve the teacher's time and are related to her work situation, but do not involve student contact.

Provision was made at the end of the questionnaire for comments concerning teacher/student relationships and/or the questionnaire itself.

METHODOLOGY

Data Collection Procedures

The questionnaire was distributed to 52 nurses in two diploma Schools of Nursing in Edmonton. Prior to the distribution of the questionnaire, permission and assistance was sought from the senior administrators of the two programs. On April 27, 1981, a meeting to explain the nature of the study and to request a meeting with the faculty members took place with the Chairman, Health Sciences Department, Grant MacEwan Community College. The date of this meeting coincided with the monthly Health Sciences Department meeting scheduled that afternoon. Permission was granted to meet with the faculty to explain the study and to solicit support for completing the questionnaire.

On the same date, initial contact was made by phone to request a meeting with the Director - Nursing Education, Royal Alexandra Hospital School of Nursing. The meeting was scheduled for May 7, 1981, to explain the study and to request a meeting with faculty members of this program. Once again, permission was granted and a luncheon meeting with faculty members was scheduled for May 22, 1981. In both institutions, the senior administrators offered the services of the secretaries in the collection of the completed questionnaires from their faculty members.

Meetings with the nurse educators took place April 27 and May 22, 1981 respectively. At each meeting with the faculty members, the nature of the study was explained and assurance given regarding confidentiality and anonymity. Questions raised were answered. In each instance interest in the study was expressed and agreement to participate was verbalized.

Faculty lists were provided by the senior administrators. Between May 22 and May 29, 1981 questionnaires were either distributed by the secretaries via faculty mailboxes or delivered by the researcher. A small percentage of questionnaires were mailed to those faculty members who would not be present at their place of employment within a one week period. A letter accompanying each questionnaire explained the purpose of the study and requested each respondent to return the completed questionnaire in the self-addressed envelope which was then to be returned to a designated secretary in each institution. Of the total 52 questionnaires distributed 30 were distributed at the Royal Alexandra Hospital School of Nursing and 22 were distributed to the faculty at Grant MacEwan Community College.

Of the questionnaires completed, twenty respondents elected to return the questionnaire by mail. These were added to the remainder of the completed questionnaires which were collected from the institutions two and three weeks from the time of distribution. In order to avoid identifying the institution from which the questionnaires were collected, all questionnaires were placed together with those received in the mail.

On June 12, 1981, a follow up letter was sent to the participating nurse educators thanking them for their assistance, and reminding them to return the completed questionnaire if they had not already done so. A stamp was included with the letter as an incentive to encourage any remaining study participants who wished to complete the questionnaire to do so as soon as possible. All correspondence is included in Appendix B.

A total of forty-three questionnaires or 82.7 percent were returned by June 26, 1981. All returns were usable. Table 1 summarizes information related to the distribution and return of questionnaires.

DATA ANALYSIS

The survey instrument was constructed to facilitate key punching of the raw data which could then be transferred directly to computer data cards. The following statistical analysis were utilized in this study.

1. Frequency and percentage distribution was used to describe the personal and professional data.

2. Ranking of items by means was performed to identify both the facilitator profile and detractor profile.

3. Differences in perceptions of respondents regarding the importance of personal and professional characteristics, instructional and non-instructional activities as facilitators and detractors were examined by t-test and one way analysis of variance procedures.

4. Differences in perceptions of respondents regarding discrepancies between facilitators and detractors and importance of personal and professional characteristics, instructional and non-instructional activities were examined by t-test and one-way analysis of variance procedures.

5. Open-ended responses were classified and summarized.

Table 1

Distribution And Return Of Questionnaires

School of Nursing	Questionnaires Distribution	Return N	 %
Royal Alexandra Hospital	30	24	80
Grant MacEwan Community College	22	19	86.4
Total	52	43	82.7

SUMMARY

A questionnaire was used for the collection of data for this study. Questions concerning personal and professional characteristics, and instructional and non-instructional activities were included in the questionnaire. All nurse educators in two diploma Schools of Nursing were included in this study.

Data were analyzed to provide frequency distributions, means, one-way analysis of variance and t tests.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA AND DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

This chapter describes the findings of the study. The initial section, dealing with the personal and professional data, provides a profile of the respondents. Subsequent sections discuss the respondents' perceptions of the importance of the questionnaire items as facilitators or detractors to the teacher/student relationship in the three major areas: personal and professional, instructional related activities, and non-instructional activities. The final section presents a summary of the chapter.

PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL DATA PROFILE

The nurse educators were requested to respond to eight questions regarding personal and professional data. Information concerning place of employment, age, level of education, status and extent of employment, major teaching responsibility, amount of nursing work prior to teaching, amount of teaching experience, and length of present employment was obtained. Table 2 presents the frequency and percentage distributions that summarize the responses to the eight items.

Table 2

Frequency And Percentage Distribution For Personal And Professional Data

Data	Frequency	Percent*
Present Program		
College	19	44.2
Hospital	24	55.8
AGE		
41 and over	9	20.9
36 - 40	12	27.9
31 - 35	11	25.6
30 and under	11	25.6
Level of Education		
Masters	1	2.3
Baccalaureate	35	81.4
R.N. + Post Basic Diploma	6	14.0
R.N.	1	2.3
Type of Employment		
75 - 100% Temporary	3	7.0
75 - 100% Permanent	31	72.1
0 - 74% Temporary	5	11.7
0 - 74% Permanent	5	7.0

Table 2 (continued)

Data	Frequency	Percent
Major Teaching Responsibility		
Classroom only	5	11.6
Clinical	16	37.2
Both	22	51.2
Years of Nursing Prior to Teaching		
5 years or more	16	37.2
3-4 years	10	23.3
2 years or less	17	39.5
Years of Teaching Experience		
9 years or more	19	44.2
3-8 years	15	34.9
2 years or less	9	20.9
Length of Present Employment		
7 year or more	15	34.9
3-6 years	14	32.6
1-2 years	7	16.3
less than 1 year	7	16.3

* Where totals do not equal 100% error due to rounding.

Place of Employment

Table 2 shows that of the 43 respondents in the survey 24 or 55.8 percent were employed in a hospital diploma program. The remaining 19 respondents or 44.2 percent were employed in a college diploma program.

Age

Table 2 indicates that an equal number of the respondents were 30 and younger and between 31 and 35. These groups comprised 25.6 percent each of the total group. Therefore, slightly more than one half (51.2%) of the respondents were 35 years of age or younger. The greatest percentage (27.9%) were in the age group 36-40 years, with the smallest percentage (20.9%) occurring in the 41 and over age group.

Level of Education

The majority of the respondents (81.4%) indicated a baccalaureate degree as their highest level of education. The number of nurses prepared at the Master's level (2.3%) and R.N. diploma level (2.3%) comprised the smallest group. Although the majority of the respondents had a baccalaureate degree, 6 or 14 percent indicated they had a post-basic diploma in addition to their R.N. diploma. This study included the perceptions held by all nurse educators in the survey.

Type of Employment

As shown in Table 2, the majority of the respondents

(72.1%) were employed in a full-time permanent position. The remainder of the nurse educators surveyed were employed on a temporary or part-time basis (18.7%) or permanent part time basis (7%).

Areas of Major Teaching Responsibility

Table 2 shows that 37.2 percent of the respondents indicated clinical instruction as their major area of responsibility, while classroom instructors (11.6%) comprised the smallest group. However, slightly more than one half of the respondents (51.2%) were employed in both classroom and clinical instruction. The fact that the majority of the respondents had teaching responsibilites in both areas might have an effect on their responses regarding the teacher/student relationship since they interact with students in two different educational settings. It is generally believed that nurse educators who are in both the classroom and clinical practice area are likely to have more contact with students.

Years of Nursing Prior to Teaching

An almost equal proportion of nurse educators had 2 years or less (39.5%) or 5 years or more (37.2%) of nursing work prior to teaching. The remainder of the respondents (23.3%) indicated they had 3 to 4 years of nursing experience prior to becoming nurse educators. However, slightly more than one third of the respondents worked 5 years or more in general nursing before embarking on a teaching career, whereas approximately two-thirds or 62.8 percent had 4 years or less nursing experience. It appears, therefore, that the decision to teach rather than practice nursing was made relatively early in the career of the nurse educator.

Amount of Teaching Experience in Nursing Education

Table 2 shows that 44.2 percent of the respondents indicated they had 9 years or more experience as nurse educators. Approximately 34.9 percent indicated they had been teaching 3 to 8 years, while 20.9 percent stated they had 2 years or less experience as nurse educators. Apparently, once the nurse has made the decision to teach she appears to remain in nursing education.

Length of Present Employment

Table 2 reveals an equal number of respondents (16.3%) had 1 to 2 years, or less than one year's service in their present employment. An almost equal number indicated they were employed 3 to 6 years (32.6%) or 7 years or more (34.9%) in their present place of work. The majority of the respondents (67.5%) were employed in their present place of work for 3 years or more. These nurse educators should, therefore, be fairly knowledgeable in their nurse educator role, as well as being familiar with all facets of the position.

FACILITATORS AND DETRACTORS OF TEACHER/STUDENT RELATIONSHIP

Respondents were asked to indicate their perceptions of the level of importance of items in facilitating the teacher/student relationship or detracting from the relationship in three major areas: personal and professional, instructional related activities, and non-instructional activities. Ranking of items by means was utilized to identify both the facilitator profile and detractor profile.

This section identifies and discusses the three items in each section which were perceived as having the greatest effect and the three items considered to have the least effect on the teacher/student relationship.

The final section discusses the overall facilitator profile and detractor profile.

Sub-problem 1

What personal and professional characteristics do nurse educators perceive as facilitating teacher/student relationship?

Respondents were invited to indicate the importance of personal and professional characteristics in facilitating the teacher/student relationship. Table 3 contains the means and rank order of means showing the perceived importance of each item.

The three items ranked as having the greatest importance in facilitating the teacher/student relationship were:

9. Demonstrates skills, attitudes, values to be developed by student. (Mean = 4.63)

13. Concern for each student as a person. (Mean = 4.61)

Table 3

Means and Rank Order of Means of Responses on Importance of Personal and Professional Characteristics to Facilitating Teacher/Student Relationship

Item	Mean	Rank Order
9. Demonstrates skills, attitudes, values to be developed by student.	4.63	1
13. Concern for each student as a person.	4.61	2
17. Welcomes and respects differences of opinion.	4.40	3
16. Regarded with respect by students.	4.26	4
15. Regarded as loyal and dependable by students.	4.19	5
14. Provides for meeting student group needs.	4.16	6
18. Shares thinking with students.	3.91	7
12. Concerned with students character development.	3.79	8
10. Emphasizes learning about mutually satisfying teacher/student relationships.	3.62	9
11. Stresses counselling to assist student.	3.19	10

17. Welcomes and respects differences of opinion. (Mean = 4.40)

Items which ranked lowest in importance in the opinions of the respondents were:

11. Stresses counselling to assist students. (Mean = 3.19)

10. Emphasizes learning about mutually satisfying teacher/student relationships. (Mean = 3.62)

12. Concerned with students character development. (Mean = 3.79)

As indicated in Table 3 all ten items in this section were perceived by the respondents to have moderate to very great importance in facilitating the teacher/student relationship.

Six of the ten items in this section were, in fact, perceived as having great or very great importance in facilitating the teacher/student relationship, while the remaining four items were perceived as having moderate importance. It appears that nurse educators perceive the area of pesonal and professional characteristics is of value to relationships with students.

Sub-problem 2

Which personal and professional characteristics are perceived by nurse educators as detracting from the teacher/student relationship?

Respondents were requested to indicate the degree to which personal and professional characteristics detracted from the teacher/student relationship.

Table 4 summarizes the means and rank order of means showing the degree to which each item was perceived as detracting from the relationship.

The three items ranked as detracting to the greatest extent were:

16. Regarded with respect by students. (Mean = 2.10)

11. Stresses counselling to assist students. (Mean = 2.02)

14. Provides for meeting student group needs (Mean = 2.02)

The items which ranked as detracting to the least extent were:

10. Emphasizes learning about mutually satisfying teacher/student relationship. (Mean = 1.77)

13. Concern for each student as a person. (Mean = 1.81)

15. Regarded as loyal and dependable by students. (Mean = 1.88)

All the items, as shown in Table 4, were perceived as detracting only to some extent from the teacher/student relationship. It appears that nurse educators perceive personal and professional characteristics of the teacher to have little or no effect in detracting from the relationship between teacher and student.

Table 4

Means and Rank Order of Means of Responses on Extent to Which Personal and Professional Characteristics Detract From The Teacher/Student Relationship

Item	Mean	Rank Order
16. Regarded with respect by students.	2.10	1
11. Stresses counselling to assist student.	2.02	2.5*
14. Provides for meeting student group needs.	2.02	2.5*
9. Demonstrates skills, attitudes, values to be developed by student.	1.98	4.5*
17. Welcomes and respects differences of opinion.	1.98	4.5*
12. Concerned with students character development.	1.95	6
18. Shares thinking with students.	1.90	7
15. Regarded as loyal and dependable by students.	1.88	8
13. Concern for each student as a person.	1.81	9
10. Emphasizes learning about mutually satisfying teacher/student relationship.	1.77	10

* Indicates tied ranks

Sub-problem 3

What facets of instructional activities of nursing education are perceived as facilitating the teacher/student relationship?

The survey participants were requested to indicate the importance of instructional activities in facilitating the teacher/student relationship. The means and rank order of means showing the perceived importance of each item are contained in Table 5.

The three items ranked as most important in facilitating the teacher/student relationship were:

25. Size of group in clinical instruction. (Mean = 4.67)

20. Student contact hours available to assist individual students. (Mean = 4.05)

24. Size of classes in classroom instruction. (Mean = 4.02)

The three items which ranked as having least importance to the relationship were:

23. Time spent correcting assignments per week. (Mean = 2.72)

26. Time spent on curriculum planning meetings. (Mean = 2.77)

19. Hours of classroom teaching per week. (Mean = 3.12)

As indicated in Table 5, six of the eight items in this

Table 5

Means and Rank Order of Means of Responses on Importance of Instructional Related Activities to Facilitating Teacher/Student Realtionship

Item	Mean	Rank Order
25. Size of group in clinical instruction.	4.67	1
20. Student contact hours available to assist individual students.	4.05	2
24. Size of classes in classroom instruction.	4.02	3
21. Hours of clinical teaching per week.	4.00	4
22. Preparation time available during work-day.	3.49	5
19. Hours of classroom teaching per week.	3.12	6
26. Time spent on curriculum planning meetings.	2.77	7
23. Time spent correcting assignments per week.	2.72	8

section were perceived as having moderate to very great importance in facilitating the teacher/student relationship. It appears that nurse educators perceived only two of the eight instructional items to having less than a moderate degree of importance to the relationship.

Sub-problem 4

What facets of instructional activities of nursing education are perceived as detracting from the teacher/student relationship?

The survey participants were requested to indicate the degree to which instructional activities detracted from the teacher/student relationship.

Table 6 indicates the means and rank order of means of the items to the extent that the items detract from the teacher/student relationship.

The three items perceived as detracting to the greatest extent were:

25. Size of group in clinical instruction. (Mean = 3.74)

24. Size of classes in clinical instruction. (Mean = 3.26)

26. Time spent on curriculum planning meetings. (Mean = 2.77)

Those three items which were perceived as detracting to the least extent were:

21. Hours of clinical teaching per week. (Mean = 2.12)

20. Student contact hours available to assist

Table 6

Means and Rank Order of Means of Responses on Extent to Which Instructional Related Activities Detract From Teacher/Student Relationship

Item	Mean	Rank Order
25. Size of group in clinical instruction.	3.74	1
24. Size of classes in classroom instruction.	3.26	2
26. Time spent on curriculum planning meetings.	2.77	3
23. Time spent correcting assignments per week.	2.62	4
22. Preparation time available during work-day.	2.33	5
19. Hours of classroom teaching per week.	2.19	6.5*
20. Student contact hours available to assist individual students.	2.19	6.5*
21. Hours of clinical teaching per week.	2.12	8

* Indicates tied ranks.

5

individual students. (Mean = 2.19)

19. Hours of classroom teaching per week. (Mean = 2.19)

As indicated in Table 6, six of the eight items in this section were perceived as detracting only to some extent from the teacher/student relationship. Only two of eight instructional items were perceived as detracting to a great extent from the relationship. Apparently class and group size is of concern to educators in facilitating a relationship with students.

Sub-problem 5

Which tasks of the non-instructional activities in nursing education are perceived as facilitating the teacher/student relationship?

Respondents were invited to indicate the importance of non-instructional activities in facilitating the teacher/student relationship. Table 7 contains the means and rank order of means showing the perceived importance of each item.

The three items which were perceived as having the most importance in facilitating teacher/student relationship were:

31. Time spent establishing rapport with staff in clinical area. (Mean = 3.95)

24. Time spent preparing for clinical assignments. (Mean = 3.74)

32. Time spent communciating with supervisory person-

Table 7

Means and Rank Order of Means of Responses on Importance of Non-Instructional Activities to Facilitating Teacher/Student Relationship

Item	Mean	Rank Order
31. Time spent establishing rapport with staff in clinical area.	3.95	1
24. Time spent preparing for clinical assignments.	3.74	2
32. Time spent communicating with supervisory personnel in clinical area.	3.40	3
28. Time spent on teaching aids.	2.51	4
30. Time spent in faculty meetings.	2.33	5
29. Time spent in faculty committee work.	2.31	6
27. Time spent on clerical activities.	2.05	7
33. Time spent preparing for committee meetings.	1.91	8

nel in clinical area. (Mean = 3.40)

The three items perceived as having the least amount of importance to the relationship were:

33. Time spent preparing for committee meetings. (Mean = 1.91)

27. Time spent on clerical activities. (Mean = 205)

29. Time spent in faculty committee work. (Mean = 2.31)

Table 7 indicates only three of the eight items in this section were perceived to have great importance in facilitating the teacher/student relationship. It appears that nurse educators perceived the remaining five non-instructional items to have little or no importance in facilitating the relationship between between teacher and student.

Sub-problem 6

Which tasks of the non-instructional activities in nursing education are perceived as detracting from the teacher/student relationship?

Respondents were invited to indicate the degree to which non-instructional activities detracted from the teacher/student relationship. Table 8 presents the means and rank order of means showing the extent the items detracted from the relationship.

The three items which were perceived as detracting to the greatest extent were:

27. Time spent on clerical activities. (Mean = 3.14)

29. Time spent in faculty committee work. (Mean =

Table 8

Means and Rank Order of Means of Responses on Extent to Which Non-Instructional Activities Detract From Teacher/Student Relationship

Item	Mean	Rank Order
27. Time spent on clerical activities.	3.14	1
29. Time spent in faculty committee work.	2.95	2
30. Time spent in faculty meetings.	2.64	3
28. Time spent on teaching aids.	2.42	4
33. Time spent preparing for committee meetings.	2.37	5
34. Time spent preparing for clinical assignments.	1.95	6
31. Time spent establishing rapport with staff in clinical area.	1.79	7
32. Time spent communicating with supervisory personnel in clinical area.	1.65	8

2.95)

30. Time spent in faculty meetings. (Mean = 2.64)

In the opinion of the respondents, the three items perceived as detracting to the least extent from the teacher/student relationship were:

32. Time spent communicating with supervisory personnel in clinical area. (Mean = 1.65)

31. Time spent establishing rapport with staff in clinical area. (Mean = 1.79)

34. Time spent preparing for clinical assignments. (Mean = 1.95)

Table 8 shows that nurse educators perceived only one of the eight items in this section as detracting to a moderate extent from the teacher/student relationship. Indeed, seven of the eight non-instructional items were perceived as having little or no affect in detracting from the relationship between teacher and student.

Overall Level of Importance of Facilitator Profile

In order to clearly identify those items which were perceived to have the greatest and least importance in facilitating the teacher/student relationship an overall summary of the facilitator profile was prepared. This section discusses those items which the respondents perceived as having the most importance in facilitating the teacher/student relationships.

Table 9 contains a summary of the means and rank order

Table 9

Means and Rank Order of Means of Responses Overall Importance of Items to Facilitating Teacher/Student Relationship

Item	Mean	Rank Order
Personal and Professional Characteristics		
9. Demonstrates skills, attitudes, values to be developed by student	4.63	2
10. Emphasizes learning about mutually satisfying teacher/student relationships.	3.62	15
11. Stresses counselling to assist student.	3.19	18
12. Concerned with students character development.	3.79	13
13. Concern for each student as a person.	4.61	3
14. Provides for meeting student group needs.	4.16	7
15. Regarded as loyal and dependable by students.	4.19	6
16. Regarded with respect by students.	4.26	5
17. Welcomes and respects differences of opinion.	4.40	4
18. Shares thinking with students.	3.91	12

Table 9 (Continued)

Item	Mean	Rank Order
Instructional Related Activities		
19. Hours of classroom teaching per week.	3.12	19
20. Student contact hours available to assist individual students.	4.05	8
21. Hours of clinical teaching per week.	4.00	10
22. Preparation time available during workday.	3.49	16
23. Time spent correcting assignments per week.	2.72	21
24. Size of classes in classroom instruction.	4.02	9
25. Size of group in clinical instruction.	4.67	1
26. Time spent on curriculum planning meetings.	2.77	20

Table 9 (Continued)

Item	Mean	Rank Order
Non-Instructional Activities		
27. Time spent on clerical activities.	2.05	25
28. Time spent on teaching aids.	2.51	22
29. Time spent in faculty committee work.	2.31	24
30. Time spent in faculty meetings.	2.33	23
31. Time spent establishing repport with staff in clinical area.	3.95	11
32. Time spent communicating with supervisory personnel in clinical area.	3.40	17
33. Time spent preparing for committee meetings.	1.91	26
34. Time spent preparing for clinical assignments.	3.74	14

of means of each item. The five items ranked as having most importance to facilitating the teacher/student relationship were:

25. Size of group in clinical instuction. (Mean = 4.67)

9. Demonstrates skills, attitudes, values to be developed by student. (Mean = 4.63)

13. Concern for each student as a person. (Mean = 4.61)

17. Welcomes and respects differences of opinion. (Mean = 4.40)

16. Regarded with respect by students. (Mean = 4.26)

The five items which ranked lowest in importance in the opinions of the respondents were:

33. Time spent preparing for committee meetings. (Mean = 1.91)

27. Time spent on clerical activities. (Mean = 2.05)

29. Time spent in faculty committee work. (Mean = 2.31)

30. Time spent in faculty meetings. (Mean = 2.33)

28. Time spent on teaching aids. (Mean = 2.51)

Of the 26 items listed, ten items were rated as having "Great" or "Very Great Importance" in facilitating a teacher/student relationship. A total of seven items were of "Some Importance" or "No Importance."

The item which was rated as most important related to the area of instructional activities while the four remaining items which rated in the top five related to the area of personal and professional characteristics. It would appear that the respondents perceived personal and professional characteristics as the most important items in facilitating the teacher/student relationships. Since these items appear to relate to humanism, it would seem that these are the areas most valued by the nurse educators. However, the "size of group in clinical instruction," where the instructor generally has a closer relationship with students, was perceived to be of greatest importance in facilitating teacher/student relationships.

According to the respondents, the five items which contributed the least to facilitating teacher/student relationships were in the area of non-instructional activities. In the opinion of the nurse educators, time spent in meetings or activities which did not involve student contact, were not perceived as facilitating a relationship with students.

Overall Level of Importance of Detractor Profile

In order to more clearly identify those items which were perceived to detract from the teacher/student relationship to the greatest or least extent, an overall summary of the detractor profile is presented in Table 10. In this section those items which were perceived as having the most and least importance in detracting from the teacher/ student relationship are discussed.

The five items ranked as detracting to the greatest

Table 10

Means and Rank Order of Means of Responses
Overall Extent That Items Detract From
Teacher/Student Relationship

Item	Mean	Rank Order
Personal and Professional Characteristics		
9. Demonstrates skills, attitudes, values to be developed by student	1.98	17.5*
10. Emphasizes learning about mutually satisfying teacher/student relationships.	1.77	25
11. Stresses counselling to assist student.	2.02	15.5*
12. Concerned with students character development.	1.95	19.5*
13. Concern for each student as a person.	1.81	23
14. Provides for meeting student group needs.	2.02	15.5*
15. Regarded as loyal and dependable by students.	1.88	22
16. Regarded with respect by students. assignments.	2.10	14
17. Welcomes and respects differences of opinion.	1.98	17.5*
18. Shares thinking with students.	1.90	21

---

* Indicates tied ranks

Table 10 (Continued)

Item	Mean	Rank Order
Instructional Related Activities		
19. Hours of classroom teaching per week.	2.19	11.5*
20. Student contact hours available to assist individual students.	2.19	11.5*
21. Hours of clinical teaching per week.	2.12	13
22. Preparation time available during workday.	2.33	10
23. Time spent correcting assignments per week.	2.62	7
24. Size of classes in classroom instruction.	3.26	2
25. Size of group in clinical instruction.	3.74	1
26. Time spent on curriculum planning meetings.	2.77	5

* Indicates tied ranks

Table 10 (Continued)

Item	Mean	Rank Order
Non-Instructional Activities		
27. Time spent on clerical activities.	3.14	3
28. Time spent on teaching aids.	2.42	8
29. Time spent in faculty committee work.	2.95	4
30. Time spent in faculty meetings.	2.64	6
31. Time spent establishing rapport with staff in clinical area.	1.79	24
32. Time spent communicating with supervisory personnel in clinical area.	1.65	26
33. Time spent preparing for committee meetings.	2.37	9
34. Time spent preparing for clinical assignments.	1.95	19.5*

* Indicates tied ranks

extent from the teacher/student relationship were:

25. Size of group in clinical instruction. (Mean = 3.74)

24. Size of classes in classroom instruction. (Mean = 3.26)

27. Time spent on clerical activities. (Mean = 3.14)

29. Time spent in faculty committee work. (Mean = 2.95)

26. Time spent on curriculum planning meetings. (Mean = 2.77)

The five items which were perceived as detracting the least from the teacher/student relationship were:

32. Time spent communicating with supervisory personnel in clinical area. (Mean = 1.65)

10. Emphasizes learning about mutually satisfying teacher/student relationship. (Mean = 1.77)

31. Time spent establishing rapport with staff in clinical area. (Mean = 1.79)

13. Concern for each student as a person. (Mean = 1.81)

15. Regarded as loyal and dependable by students. (Mean = 1.88)

In the opinion of the nurse educators, student body size in both classroom and clinical area was considered to greatly detract from establishing a facilitative relationship. Time spent in meetings and other activities which did not include students was perceived to moderately detract from the relationship.

According to the respondents of the five items which were perceived as affecting the teacher/student relationship to the least extent, three were from the personal and professional area. The remainder of the five items were contained in the area of non-instructional activities.

Of the 26 items listed, only three items were rated as detracting to a "Moderate Extent" or "Great Extent." The remaining 23 items were perceived by nurse educators as detracting to "Some Extent" or "No Extent" from the teacher/student relationship. Clearly the majority of the items were perceived as detracting from the relationship very slightly.

Sub-problem 7

To what extent do personal and professional data of age, teaching experience, general nursing experience prior to teaching, educational preparation, and place, extent and status of employment affect the perceptions of respondents regarding the facilitators and detractors in the teacher/student relationship?

Respondents were asked to indicate their perceptions of the level of importance selected personal and professional data had in facilitating the teacher/student relationship or in detracting from the relationship. The statistical procedures of one-way analysis of variance and t-tests were used to test statistical differences in their perceptions.

One-way analysis of variance is generally considered to be an appropriate statistical technique in a situation when interval data are available from more than two groups of respondents. However, where the data are drawn from two groups, the t-test is considered to be an appropriate statistical technique.

This section identifies and discusses those items in which statistically significant mean differences occurred.

Personal and Professional Data as Facilitators

Age. Table 11 presents the findings of the perceived importance of items to facilitating the teacher/student relationship on the basis of age. All instructors who were 31 years of age or older perceived that "time spent on curriculum planning meetings," which appears in instructional activities, facilitated the teacher's relationships with her students more than did those instructors who were 30 years of age or younger. Those instructors who were between the ages of 36 and 40 perceived that "time spent in faculty committee work," from the area of non-instructional activities, facilitated the relationship to a greater degree than did those who were between the ages of 21 to 30. One might assume that nurse educators who were older had also been teaching longer and therefore viewed time spent on activities which did not include students could still positively affect teacher/student relationships.

However, on all remaining items, age did not affect the

Table 11

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Importance of Items to Facilitating Teacher/Student Relationship on Basis of Age

Item	Mean Scores				F Ratio	F Prob	Pairs significantly different at 0.1 Level[1]
	Group 1 21-30 (N=11)	Group 2 31-35 (N=11)	Group 3 36-40 (N=12)	Group 4 41 or older (N=9)			
26. Time spent on curriculum planning meetings.	1.8	3.0	3.0	3.2	4.4	0.0	2 > 1 3 > 1 4 > 1
29. Time spent in faculty committee work.	1.6	2.0	2.9	2.7	4.1	0.0	3 > 1

---

[1] Scheffé procedure

perceived importance of the facilitators on the teacher/student relationship.

Major teaching responsibility. Table 12 shows the degree of importance of items in facilitating the relationship between teacher and students on the basis of major teaching area. Those nurse educators who taught in both clinical and classroom areas perceived that "concern with students character development" had a greater importance in facilitating the teacher/student relationship than did nurses who taught only in the clinical area. This finding is not surprising since nurse educators are concerned with socializing the student into the role of nurse where specific behaviors and attitudes are often considered essential for a nurse to possess. It appears that only one item, from the area of personal and professional characteristics, was significant. All remaining items did not affect the perceived importance of facilitators in the teacher/student relationship when considering major teaching responsibility.

Nursing work prior to teaching. Table 13 shows that instructors who had two years or less nursing experience prior to teaching placed more importance on "time spent on teaching aids" as facilitating the teacher/student relationship than those instructors who had 3 to 4 years nursing work prior to teaching. Perhaps those instructors who had been teaching longer had most of their teaching aids prepared previously, therefore, placed less value to this item. This item, from the area of non-instructional activities,

Table 12

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Importance of Items to Facilitating Teacher/Student Relationship on Basis of Areas of Major Teaching Responsibilities

Item	Mean Scores			F Ratio	F Prob	Pairs significantly different at 0.1 level[1]
	Group 1 Classroom Only (N=5)	Group 2 Clinical Only (N=16)	Group 3 Both (N=22)			
12. Concerned with students character development.	3.6	3.3	4.2	4.8	0.0	3 > 2

[1] Scheffé procedure

Table 13

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Importance of Items to Facilitating Teacher/Student Relationship on Basis of Amount of Nursing Prior to Teaching Experience

Item	Mean Scores			F Ratio	F Prob	Pairs significantly different at 0.1 Level[1]
	Group 1 2 years or less (N=17)	Group 2 3-4 years (N=10)	Group 3 5 years or more (N=16)			
28. Time spent on teaching aids.	2.8	1.8	2.6	2.7	0.1	1 > 2

---

[1] Scheffé procedure

was the only item to be perceived as significant by the nurse educators. On all remaining items, however, nursing work prior to teaching was not perceived as important in facilitating the relationship between teacher and student.

Teaching experience. The five items which showed statistically significant mean differences in their perceived effect as facilitators on the teacher/student relationship on the basis of amount of teaching experience in nursing education are shown in Table 14. Instructors who had the most teaching experience (9 years or more) perceived significantly greater importance to the item "concern for each student as a person," from the area personal and professional characteristics, than did the group who had the least teaching experience (2 years or less).

Group 2, those instructors who had 3 to 8 years teaching experience, perceived that the item "student contact hours available to assist individual students," which appears in the instructional activities section, was of greater importance in facilitating the teacher/student relationship than did instructors with two or fewer years of experience.

Table 14 also shows instructors who had 3 years or more experience in teaching, perceived the items of "time spent establishing rapport with staff in clinical area" and "time spent preparing for clinical assignments," both from the non-instructional area, contributed more to facilitating the teacher/student relationship than those instructors with two

Table 14

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Importance of Items to Facilitating Teacher/Student Relationship on Basis of Amount of Teaching Experience in Nursing Education

	Item	Mean Scores			F Ratio	F Prob	Pairs significantly different at 0.1 Level[1]
		Group 1 2 years or less (N=9)	Group 2 3-8 years (N=15)	Group 3 9 years or more (N=19)			
13.	Concern for each student as a person.	4.1	4.7	4.8	3.3	0.0	3 > 1
20.	Student contract hours available to assist individual students.	3.7	4.4	3.9	3.3	0.0	2 > 1
31.	Time spent establishing rapport with staff in clinical area.	3.0	4.3	4.2	5.3	0.0	2 > 1 3 > 1
32.	Time spent communicating with supervisory personnel in clinical area.	2.3	3.5	3.8	4.7	0.0	3 > 1
34.	Time spent preparing for clinical assignments.	3.0	4.0	3.9	3.6	0.0	2 > 1 3 > 1

[1] Scheffé procedure

years or less teaching experience. One can only speculate that the role of teacher is relatively new to instructors with 2 years or less teaching experience and therefore they may not be totally familiar with all aspects of the position which might affect teacher/student relationships.

Those instructors with the most teaching experience also perceived that the "time spent communciating with supervisory personnel in the clinical area," also from the non-instructional area, was of greater importance to facilitating the relationship between teacher and student than the instructors with the least teaching experience.

It appears that the instructors with the least amount of teaching experience perceived the five items in this section had less importance to the teacher/student relationship than did the instructors who had more teaching experience.

Length of present employment. Seven items had statistically significant mean differences when the instructors indicated their perceptions of the items as facilitators on the teacher/student relationship on the basis of length of present employment according to Table 15. Of the seven items presented, the first shown was from the area of personal and professional characteristics. The remaining six items in this section appear in the non-instructional area.

Nurse educators who had the longest tenure in their present employment (7 years or more) perceived that "concern for each student as a person" had greater importance to the teacher/student relationship than did the educators who were

Table 15

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Importance of Items to Facilitating Teacher/Student Relationship on Basis of Length of Present Employment

	Item	Mean Scores						
		Group 1 <1 year (N=7)	Group 2 1-2 years (N=7)	Group 3 3-6 years (N=14)	Group 4 7 years or more (N=15)	F Ratio	F Prob	Pairs significantly different at 0.1 Level[1]
13.	Concern for each student as a person	4.0	4.7	4.6	4.8	2.5	0.1	4 > 1
28.	Time spent on teaching aids.	1.6	3.3	2.5	2.6	2.8	0.1	2 > 1
29.	Time spent in faculty committee work.	1.4	2.7	2.1	2.7	3.2	0.0	4 > 1 2 > 1
30.	Time spent in faculty meetings	1.4	3.0	2.1	2.6	3.5	0.0	2 > 1
31.	Time spent establishing rapport with staff in clinical area	3.1	3.6	4.4	4.1	2.9	0.0	3 > 1
32.	Time spent communicating with supervisory personnel in clinical area.	2.3	2.9	3.9	3.7	3.4	0.0	3 > 1
34.	Time spent preparing for clinical assignments	2.7	3.6	4.0	4.1	4.1	0.0	4 > 1 3 > 1

[1] Scheffé procedure

in their present place of employment less than 1 year. However, all instructors perceived this activity as having great or very great importance to facilitating the teacher/student relationship. Instructors who were in their present employment 1 to 2 years perceived "time spent on teaching aids" was of greater importance as facilitator than did those instructors with less than one year in their present employment.

The nurse educators who were in their place of employment 1 to 2 years or 7 years or more perceived that "time spent in faculty committee work" was more important to facilitating the teacher/student relationship than did those instructors who were employed for the shortest time (less than one year) in their present employment.

Table 15 shows that the instructors who were in their present employment 1 to 2 years perceived that "time spent in faculty meetings" had greater importance to facilitating a relationship between teacher and student, than did those instructors with less than one year in their present employment.

Nurse educators with 3 to 6 years in their present employment perceived that the items "time spent establishing rapport with staff" and "communicating with supervisory personnel in the clinical area" was of greater importance than those instructors with less than one year in their present employment in facilitating the teacher/student relationship.

Table 15 also shows that the instructors who were in their place of employment 3 years or more indicated they perceived that "time spent preparing for clinical assignments" was more important in facilitating the relationship between teacher and student than did those instructors with less than one year in their present employment.

The instructors with least amount of time (less than one year) indicated they perceived all the items in the section of non-instructional activities to have less importance in facilitating the teacher/student relationship than did all other instructors. Perhaps these findings are due to the fact they were not familiar with all activities of the teacher role. Apparently, no item from the instructional area had an effect on the perceived importance of facilitator on the teacher/student relationship on the basis of length of employment.

Program. Table 16 shows the two items which had statistically significant mean differences between the two programs surveyed in this study. The instructors in the hospital program ascribed greater importance to "concern with the students character development" in facilitating the teacher/ student relationship than did the instructors teaching in the college program. The instructors in the college program, however, ascribed greater importance for "concern for each student as a person" as a facilitator for the teacher/student relationship than did instructors

Table 16

t-Test Comparison of Importance of Items to Facilitating Teacher/Student Relationship on Basis of Program

Item	Mean Score					
	Group 1 College Program (N=19)	Group 2 Hospital Program (N=24)	t Value	2 tailed Prob[1]	df	Comparison
12. Concerned with students character development	3.47	4.04	-2.04	0.05	41	2 > 1
13. Concern for each student as a person	4.84	4.42	2.24	0.03	34	1 > 2

[1] P = < 0.05

in the hospital program. Both of these items appear in the area of personal and professional characteristics. It appears that both programs are concerned about students as individuals. However, on all remaining items, program did not affect the perceived importance of the facilitators on the teacher/student relationship.

Level of education. Table 17 shows that those instructors who did not have a degree beyond the registered nurse level of preparation ascribed greater importance to "emphasizes learning about mutually satisfying teacher/student relationships," appearing in the area of personal and professional characteristics, as a facilitator of the relationship between teacher and student than did those nurse educators who had a university degree in addition to the diploma level of education. Possibly, the nurse educators who had attended university had undertaken studies dealing with teacher/ student relationships and therefore placed less importance on this item.

All other items, however, did not affect the perceived importance of the facilitators on the teacher/student relationship, when considered on the basis of level of education.

Status of employment. Table 18 indicates that nurse educators who had permanent status ascribed greater importance to the instructional related activity of "student contact hours available to assist individual students" as a

Table 17

t-Test Comparison of Importance of Items to Facilitating Teacher/Student Relationship on Basis of Education

Item	Mean Score					
	Group 1 No Degree (N=7)	Group 2 University Degree (N=36)	t Value	2 tailed Prob[1]	df	Comparison
10. Emphasizes learning about mutually satisfying teacher/student relationships.	4.57	3.43	2.46	0.02	40	1 > 2

---

[1] $p = < 0.05$

Table 18

t-Test Comparison of Importance of Items to Facilitating Teacher/Student Relationship on Basis of Status of Employment

Item	Mean Score					
	Group 1 Perman-ent (N=34)	Group 2 Tempor-ary (N=8)	t Value	2 tailed Prob[1]	df	Comparison
20. Student contact hours available to assist individual students.	4.15	3.50	2.31	0.03	40	1 > 2

---

[1] P = < 0.05

facilitator than did those instructors who were employed in a temporary capacity. Possibly the nurse educators who were employed in a permanent capacity felt more involved in the education program than did those employed in a temporary capacity. The remaining items apparently did not affect the perceived importance of the facilitators on the basis of status of employment.

Extent of employment. Table 19 illustrates that the nurse educators who were employed part-time placed greater importance on the personal and professional characteristic of "provides for meeting student group needs" than did those nurse educators employed in a full-time capacity. Possibly, the nurse educators employed on a part-time basis had limited contact time with students and therefore placed more importance on meeting group needs. However, on all the remaining items, extent of employment did not affect the perceived importance of the facilitators on the teacher/student relationship.

Personal and Professional Data as Detractors

Age. Table 20 indicates that the instructors who were 31 to 35 years of age perceived the item of "emphasizes learning about mutually satisfying teacher/student relationships," which is in the personal and professional characteristic area, detracted to a greater extent from the teacher/student relationship than did all the other instructors.

Instructors who were 31 to 35 years of age also per-

Table 19

t-Test Comparison of Importance of Items to Facilitating Teacher/Student Relationship on Basis of Extent of Employment

Item	Mean Score					
	Group 1 Part Time (N=8)	Group 2 Full Time (N=34)	t Value	2 tailed Prob[1]	df	Comparison
14. Provides for meeting student group needs.	4.63	4.03	2.49	0.02	40	1 > 2

[1] P = < 0.05

Table 20

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Items to Detracting From Teacher/Student Relationship on Basis of Age

Item	Mean Scores				F Ratio	F Prob	Pairs significantly different at 0.1 Level[1]
	Group 1 21-30 (N=11)	Group 2 31-35 (N=11)	Group 3 36-40 (N=12)	Group 4 41 or older (N=9)			
10. Emphasizes learning about mutually satisfying teacher/student relationships	1.2	2.6	1.4	1.9	5.6	0.0	2 > 1 2 > 3
29. Time spent in faculty committee work.	2.7	3.7	2.9	2.3	3.0	0.0	2 > 4

[1] Scheffé procedure

ceived that the item, from the area of non-instructional activities, of "time spent in faculty committee work" detracted from the teacher/student relationship to a greater extent than did those instructors who were 41 years of age or older.

The remainder of the items did not affect the perceived extent of importance of the detractors on the basis of age.

Major teaching responsibility. The three items which showed statistically significant mean differences in their perceived effect as detractors on the teacher/student relationship on the basis of major teaching responsibility appear in Table 21. The first two items appeared in the personal and professional characteristics while the third item came from the section of instructional activities. Table 21 indicates that instructors whose major area of teaching was in the clinical area perceived that being "regarded as loyal and dependable by students" detracted from the relationship between teacher and student to a greater extent than did those instructors who taught in the classroom. The clinical teachers also perceived that being "regarded with respect by students" detracted to a greater extent from the teacher/ student relationsip than did the classroom teachers. Possibly clinical instructors are concerned with the care provided to clients as well as their students which might account for these findings. The instructors who taught in both classroom and clinical areas perceived that the "hours of classroom teaching per week"

Table 21

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Items to Detracting From Teacher/Student Relationship on Basis of Areas of Major Teaching Responsibilities

Item	Mean Scores			F Ratio	F Prob	Pairs significantly different at 0.1 Level[1]
	Group 1 Classroom Only (N=5)	Group 2 Clinical Only (N=16)	Group 3 Both (N=22)			
15. Regarded as loyal and dependable by students.	1.0	2.4	1.7	2.8	0.1	2 > 1
16. Regarded with respect by students.	1.0	2.7	2.0	3.4	0.0	2 > 1
19. Hours of classroom teaching per week	2.4	1.7	2.5	4.2	0.0	3 > 2

[1] Scheffé procedure.

detracted to a greater extent from the teacher/student relationship than did those instructors who taught only in the clinical area. This finding is to be expected since clinical teachers do not teach in the classroom.

Of the three items identified as having statistically significant mean differences the instructors who taught only in the classroom area perceived the two items from the personal and professional characteristic section as detracting to a lesser extent from the teacher/student relationship than did the other instructors who taught in either the clinical area or both areas. The remaining items, however, were perceived not to effect the extent of importance of the detractors on the basis of major teaching responsibility.

Nursing work prior to teaching. Table 22 shows the four items in which statistically significant mean differences of their perceived effect as detractors on the relationship between teacher and student on the basis of nursing work prior to teaching. Nurse educators who had 5 years or more of nursing experience prior to teaching perceived that "demonstrates skills, attitudes, values to be developed by students" detracted from the teacher/student relationship to a greater extent than did those nurse educators who had 3 to 4 years nursing experience prior to teaching. This is rather surprising as one might expect that the instructors with more nursing practice experience to be more knowledgeable of the characteristics of the nurse role. Similarily, this group of instructors also perceived that being "regard-

Table 22

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Items to Detracting From Teacher/Student Relationship on Basis of Amount of Nursing Prior to Teaching Experience

Item	Mean Scores			F Ratio	F Prob	Pairs significantly different at 0.1 Level[1]
	Group 1 2 years or less (N=17)	Group 2 3 to 4 Years (N=10)	Group 3 5 years or more (N=16)			
9. Demonstrates skills, attitudes, values to be developed by students.	1.8	1.2	2.7	4.0	0.0	3 > 2
15. Regarded as loyal and dependable by students.	1.8	1.2	2.4	2.6	0.1	3 > 2
16. Regarded with respect by students.	1.9	1.3	2.7	3.4	0.0	3 > 2
27. Time spent on clerical activities	3.5	3.4	2.6	2.9	0.1	1 > 3

[1] Scheffé procedure

ed as loyal and dependable by students" and "regarded with respect by students" also detracted to greater extent from the teacher/student relationship than did the group of instructors with 3 to 4 years nursing experience. Perhaps, this indicates this group of instructors were having difficulty assuming the instructor rather than nurse role. However, the nurse educators with 2 years or less of nursing work prior to teaching perceived that "time spent on clerical activities" detracted to a greater extent the relationship between teacher and student than did nurse educators with 5 years or more nursing experience. Possibly these instructors were not aware of this activity in the teacher's role which might account for this finding.

The instructors with 3 to 4 years experience perceived 3 of the 4 items with statistically significant mean differences as affecting the teacher/student relationship to a lesser extent than did all other instructors. However, in all remaining items, nursing work prior to teaching had no affect on the perceived extent of detractors on the teacher/student relationship.

Teaching experience. Nurse educators who had been teaching 9 years or more perceived that the item "size of group in clinical instruction," from the instructional section, detracted to a greater extent from the teacher/student relationship than did those instructors with 3 to 8 years of teaching experience, as shown in Table 23. All remaining items did not affect the perceived extent of

Table 23

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Items to Detracting From Teacher/Student Relationship on Basis of Amount of Teaching Experience in Nursing Education

Item	Mean Scores			F Ratio	F Prob	Pairs significantly different at 0.1 Level[1]
	Group 1 2 years or less (N=9)	Group 2 3-8 years (N=15)	Group 3 9 years or more (N=19)			
25. Clinical group size.	3.9	3.0	4.3	6.1	0.0	3 > 2

[1] Scheffé procedure

detractors on the teacher/student relationship on the basis of teaching experience in nursing education.

Length of present employment. Table 24 shows that the nurse educators who were in their present employment 1 to 2 years considered that "time spent on teaching aids" detracted to a greater extent from the teacher/student relationship than did those who were employed less than one year in their present employment. This single item comes from the non-instructional section. All other items, on the basis of length of present employment, were not perceived to any extent as detracting to the teacher/student relationship.

Program. Table 25 shows the four items in which a statistically significant difference occurred between the two programs. The first three of the four items appeared in the personal and professional characteristics, with the fourth item coming from the instructional activity section. The instructors in the hospital program perceived that the following characteristics "provides for meeting student group needs," "regarded with respect by students", and "welcomes and respects differences of opinion" detracted to a greater extent from the teacher/student relationship, as did the activity "time spent correcting assignments per week." All other items, on the basis of program, did not effect the extent of the detractors on the teacher/student relationship.

Status of employment. Table 26 indicates that the

Table 24

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Items to Detracting From Teacher/Student Relationship on Basis of Length of Present Employment

Item	Mean Scores				F Ratio	F Prob	Pairs significantly different at 0.1 Level[1]
	Group 1 < 1 year (N=7)	Group 2 1-2 years (N=7)	Group 3 3-6 years (N=14)	Group 4 7 years or more (N=15)			
28. Time spent on teaching aids	1.6	3.4	2.2	2.5	3.5	0.0	2 > 1

[1] Scheffé procedure

Table 25

_t_-Test Comparison of Importance of Items to Detracting From Teacher/Student Relationship on Basis of Program

Item	Mean Score					
	Group 1 College Program (N=19)	Group 2 Hospital Program (N=24)	_t_ Value	2 tailed Prob[1]	df	Comparison
14. Provides for meeting student group needs.	1.61	2.35	-2.21	0.03	36	2 > 1
16. Regarded with respect by students.	1.50	2.50	-2.35	0.02	38	2 > 1
17. Welcomes and respects differences of opinion.	1.56	2.29	-2.02	0.05	38	2 > 1
23. Time spent correcting assignments per week.	2.26	2.91	-2.02	0.05	41	2 > 1

[1] $P = < 0.05$

educators employed in a permanent capacity believed that "time spent correcting assignments per week," from the instructional activity section, detracted from the teacher/student relationship more than did those teachers who were employed in a temporary capacity. One might speculate that instructors employed in a permanent capacity had more assignments to mark and therefore perceived this activity as having a greater detracting effect than did those employed in a temporary capacity who presumably did not have as many assignments to mark. All other items apparently did not affect the extent of the detractors on the teacher/student relationship on the basis of status of employment.

Extent of employment. Table 27 shows the two items, one from instructional activity area and the second from the non-instructional area, which were considered to be significant. Nurse educators employed in a part-time capacity believed that both items "hours of clinical teaching per week" and "time spent on teaching aids" detracted to a greater extent from the teacher/student relationship than did those instructors employed in a full-time capacity indicated in Table 27. However, in all the remaining items, extent of employment did not affect the perceived extent of detractors on the teacher/student relationship.

DISCREPANCY OF ITEMS BETWEEN FACILITATORS AND DETRACTORS

This section discusses the findings of the items in

Table 26

t-Test Comparison of Importance of Items to Detracting From Teacher/Student Relationship on Basis of Status of Employment

Item	Mean Score					
	Group 1 Permanent (N=34)	Group 2 Temporary (N=8)	*t* Value	2 tailed Prob[1]	df	Comparison
23. Time spent correcting assignments per week.	2.82	1.88	2.31	0.03	40	1 > 2

[1] $p < 0.05$

Table 27

t-Test Comparison of Importance of Items to Detracting From Teacher/Student Relationships on Basis of Extent of Employment

Item	Mean Score					
	Group 1 Part-Time (N=8)	Group 2 Full Time (N=34)	t Value	2 tailed Prob[1]	df	Comparison
21. Hours of clinical teaching per week.	2.75	1.94	2.02	0.05	40	1 > 2
28. Time spent on teaching aids.	3.13	2.18	2.21	0.03	40	1 > 2

[1] P = < 0.05

which a discrepancy occurred as to whether an item facilitated or detracted from the teacher/student relationship. The discrepancy of items was determined by subtracting the means of the items deemed to be detractors from the means of the same items which were also considered to be facilitators.

Respondents were requested to indicate their perceptions of the level of importance selected personal and professional characteristics, instructional and non-instructional activities had in facilitating the teacher/student relationship or in detracting from the relationship.

To test statistical differences in their perceptions the statistical procedures of one-way analysis of variance and t-tests were used.

Sub-problem 8

To what degree do the respondents perceive a discrepancy of personal and professional characteristics and instructional and non-instructional activities as facilitators and detractors to the teacher/student relationship?

Age. Table 28 shows the perceived discrepancy of five items which occurred on the basis of age. The first item shown was from the personal and professional characteristics section, the second item appearing from the instructional area and the remaining three were from the non-instructional section.

Instructors who were 21 to 30 years of age and 36 to 40 years of age perceived that "emphasizes learning about

Table 28

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Discrepancy of Items Between Facilitators and Detractors on Basis of Age (F-D)

Item	Mean Scores				F Ratio	F Prob	Pairs significantly different at 0.1 Level[1]
	Group 1 21-30 (N=11)	Group 2 31-35 (N=11)	Group 3 36-40 (N=12)	Group 4 41 or older (N=9)			
10. Emphasizes learning about mutually satisfying teacher/student relationships.	2.5	0.7	2.4	1.9	4.1	0.0	1 > 2 3 > 2
26. Time spent on curriculum planning meetings.	-1.4	0.3	0.5	0.7	3.8	0.0	1 > 3 1 > 4
27. Time spent on clerical activities.	-1.5	-2.0	-0.5	-0.2	4.0	0.0	2 > 3 2 > 4
29. Time spent in faculty committee work.	-1.1	-1.7	0.0	0.4	6.7	0.0	1 > 4 2 > 4 2 > 3
30. Time spent in faculty meetings.	-1.0	-1.0	0.3	0.7	5.6	0.0	1 > 3 1 > 4 2 > 4

---

[1] Scheffé procedure

mutually satisfying teacher/student relationships" was more of a facilitator than a detractor than did the instructors who were 31 to 35 years of age.

The instructors who were 21 to 30 years of age also considered "time spent on curriculum planning meetings" was more of a detractor than a facilitator, than did those instructors who were 36 years of age or older.

The group of instructors who were between the ages of 31 to 35 perceived that "time spent on clerical activities" was more of a detractor than a facilitator than did instructors who were 36 years of age or older.

Table 28 also indicates that the instructors who were between the ages of 21 and 35 believed that "time spent in faculty committee work" was more of a detractor than a facilitator, than did their colleagues who were 41 years of age or older. However, instructors who were 31 to 35 years of age perceived this item to be more of a detractor than facilitator than did the instructors who were between the ages of 36 to 40 years.

The item "time spent in faculty meetings" was viewed as more of a detractor than facilitator by the younger instructors (those between 21 and 30) than did the instructors who were 36 years of age and older. Instructors who were 31 to 35 years of age also viewed this item to be more of a detractor than facilitator then did instructors who were 41 years of age or older.

Of the five items identified which were perceived to have a discrepancy, the item which came from the personal and professional characteristics section was considered to be more of a facilitator than detractor. The remaining four items, however, were considered to have more of a detracting than facilitating effect on the teacher/student relationship.

The youngest group of instructors perceived a greater discrepancy in four of the five items. However, the older age group perceived the least amount of discrepancy on four of the five items identified.

Teaching responsibilities. The items which were perceived by the respondents to have a discrepancy on the basis of teaching responsibilities are shown in Table 29. All four items appearing in this table were from the section of personal and professional characteristics.

Instructors whose major responsibility was in the classroom area perceived three of the four items "stresses counselling to assist student," "regarded as loyal and dependable by students" and "welcomes and respects differences of opinion," to be more of a facilitator than a detractor to the teacher/student relationship than did instructors whose primary responsibility was in the clinical area.

Instructors who taught in both the classroom and clinical area perceived that being "concerned with students character development" was more of a facilitator than detractor than did the instructors who taught only in the clinical area.

Table 29

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Discrepancy of Items Between Facilitators and Detractors on Basis of Areas of Major Teaching Responsibilities (F-D)

Item	Mean Scores			F Ratio	F Prob	Pairs significantly different at 0.1 level[1]
	Group 1 Classroom (N=5)	Group 2 Clinical (N=16)	Group 3 Both (N=22)			
11. Stresses counselling to assist student.	2.0	0.5	1.4	3.7	0.0	1 > 2
12. Concerned with students character development.	1.8	1.0	2.5	6.6	0.0	3 > 2
15. Regarded as loyal and dependable by students.	3.8	1.7	2.4	3.7	0.0	1 > 2
17. Welcomes and respects differences of opinion.	3.6	1.9	2.5	3.2	0.0	1 > 2

---

[1] Scheffé procedure

According to Table 29, instructors who taught in the clinical area only perceived all four items identified as having less of a facilitating effect than did the instructors who taught in the classroom on three items and instructors who taught in both areas on one of the four items. One can only speculate that perhaps instructors whose primary responsibility is in the clinical area have closer contact with their students and therefore place less importance on these items.

Amount of nursing work prior to teaching. The perceived discrepancy of items on the basis of amount of nursing work prior to teaching is indicated in Table 30. Two items appear in this table. The first item was from the personal and professional section while the second item appeared in the non-instuctional activity section.

Table 30 shows that instructors who had 3 to 4 years nursing experience prior to teaching perceived the item "demonstrates skills, attitudes, values to be developed by students" was more of a facilitator than detractor to the teacher/student relationship than did those instructors with 5 years or more nursing work prior to embarking on a teaching career. However, this same group perceived "time spent on clerical activities" to be more of a detractor than facilitator than did those instructors who had worked 5 years or more in nursing.

Teaching experience in nursing education. Table 31 indicates the perceived discrepancy of the four items as facilitators or detractors on the basis of teaching experience in nursing education.

Table 30

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Discrepancy of Items

Between Facilitators and Detractors on Basis of Amount of Nursing Work

Prior To Teaching Experience (F-D)

	Mean Scores			F Ratio	F Prob	Pairs significantly different at 0.1 level[1]
	Group 1 2 years or less (N=17)	Group 2 3-4 years (N=10)	Group 3 5 years or more (N=16)			
9. Demonstrates skills, attitudes, values to be developed by students.	2.8	3.5	2.0	3.1	0.1	2 > 3
27. Time spent on clerical activities.	-1.2	-1.9	-0.5	2.9	0.1	2 > 3

[1] Scheffé procedure

Table 31

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Discrepancy of Items Between Facilitators and Detractors on Basis of Teaching Experience in Nursing Education (F-D)

	Mean Scores					
	Group 1 2 years or less (N=9)	Group 2 3-8 years (N=15)	Group 3 9 years or more (N=19)	F Ratio	F Prob	Pairs significantly different at 0.1 level[1]
19. Hours of classroom teaching per week.	0.2	1.4	0.9	2.6	0.1	2 > 1
25. Clinical group size.	0.7	1.8	0.4	6.8	0.0	2 > 1 2 > 3
32. Time spent communicating with supervisory personnel in clinical area.	0.8	1.9	2.1	2.6	0.1	3 > 1
34. Time spent preparing for clinical assignments.	0.9	2.3	1.8	2.5	0.1	2 > 1

[1] Scheffé procedure

"Hours of classroom teaching per week" was perceived by nurse educators who had been teaching 3 to 8 years to have more of a facilitating rather than detracting effect, to the relationship between teacher and student, than did instructors who had 2 years or less experience as a nurse educator.

The item "size of group in clinical instruction" was viewed by the nurse educators who had 3 to 8 years experience in teaching to be more of a facilitator than did the remaining instructors (those with 2 years or less and 9 years or more teaching experience).

The nurse educators with 9 years or more teaching experience perceived that "time spent communicating with supervisory personnel in clinical area" was more of a facilitator than a detractor than did the instructors with 2 years or less teaching experience.

"Time spent preparing for clinical assignments" was also viewed to be a greater facilitator than detractor by the nurse educators with 3 to 8 years than those with 2 years or less teaching experience.

With the exception of the item "time spent communicating with supervisory personnel in clinical area" it appears that the instructors who had 3 to 8 years teaching experience perceived that all other items identified had more of a facilitating than detracting effect to the relationship than did the instructors with less experience.

Length of present employment. According to Table 32, instructors who had been in their present employment for 3

Table 32

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Discrepancy of Items Between Facilitators and Detractors on Basis of Length of Present Employment (F-D)

Item	Mean Scores				F Ratio	F Prob	Pairs significantly different at 0.1 Level[1]
	Group 1 1 year or less (N=7)	Group 2 1-2 years (N=7)	Group 3 3-6 years (N=14)	Group 4 7 years or more (N=15)			
33. Time spent preparing for committee meetings.	-0.7	0.4	-1.3	0.0	3.2	0.0	3 > 2

[1] Scheffé procedure

to 6 years perceived that the "time spent preparing for committee meetings" detracted more than facilitated the teacher/student relationship than did those instructors who had 1 to 2 years in their present employment. This single item identified as discrepancy appeared in the non-instructional activity section.

Program. The two items which the respondents perceived to have a discrepancy on the basis of program appear in Table 33. The first item was from the area of personal and professional characteristics while the second item was from the area of non-instructional activities.

The instructors who taught in a college program believed that the items "regarded with respect by students" and "time spent preparing for clinical assignments" was more of a facilitator than a detractor than did the instructors from the hospital program.

Education. According to Table 34 the items "emphasizes learning about mutually satisfying teacher/student relationships" was perceived, by the instructors who did not have a degree, to have more of a facilitating than detracting effect to the relationship between teacher and student than did those instructors who had a degree.

COMMENTS ON THE STUDY

Respondents were invited to make comments concerning teacher/student relationships or about the study itself.

Table 33

t-Test Comparison of Discrepancy of Items Between Facilitators And Detractors on Basis of Program (F-D)

Item	Mean Score					
	Group 1 College (N=19)	Group 2 Hospital (N=24)	t Value	2 tailed Prob[1]	df	Comparison
16. Regarded with respect by students.	2.9	1.7	2.14	0.04	38	1 > 2
34. Time spent preparing for clinical assignments.	2.4	1.3	2.33	0.03	41	1 > 2

[1] $p = < 0.05$

Table 34

t-Test Comparison of Discrepancy of Items Between Facilitators And Detractors on Basis of Education (F-D)

Item	Mean Score					
	Group 1 No Degree (N=7)	Group 2 University Degree (N=36)	t Value	2 tailed Prob[1]	df	Comparison
10. Emphasizes learning about mutually satisfying teacher/student relationships	3.14	1.7	2.66	0.01	40	1 > 2

[1] p = < 0.05

Twelve, or twenty-eight percent of the respondents, accepted the opportunity to make such comments. Although the number of comments was not large, there were some interesting concerns expressed regarding teacher/student relationships.

The comments were classified under the following headings:

1. General reaction to the instrument.
2. Interest in the study.
3. Issues related to teacher/student relationships.

Comments from each category are included in this section. The comments selected for inclusion represent the major concerns within each category. When the number of comments were few, all comments were included. Contrasting points of view have also been included. In most instances the comments have been reproduced in their entirety although in some cases only excerpts are included.

General Reaction to the Instrument

Most of the comments in this category expressed concern regarding the response key provided in the instrument. Difficulty was encountered when respondents were required to respond to each item using two response keys. Some respondents had difficulty perceiving each item as both a facilitator and a detractor. Comments regarding clarity of questions also were expressed.

> I found detract part of questionnaire a bit difficult at times as I wasn't always clear on what exactly was meant with some statements eg. students regard me as loyal and dependable.

> I had difficulty in responding to the "D" part as there could be several ways of interpreting the statement eg. size of classes -- when there are large numbers it greatly detracts, when numbers are small there is minimal influence. The same holds true for clinical group size.
>
> Ambiguous questions -- what is really meant could change response.
>
> I found the format of this questionnaire somewhat difficult to initially interpret.
>
> Found it difficult to respond to most of the items in terms of facilitating, detracting as I could interpret the item as being equally the same in terms of promoting or deterring an effective relationship.
>
> I found the key at times confusing, that is, it was difficult . . . to apply all these aspects to each statement.
>
> The questions are too general to give a very specific answer (e.g., if the committee work is affecting students and is important or if it does not have a direct relationship to the student).
>
> I worked general duty 7 months then taught 1 year, worked 2 years general duty, then taught again 3 years, worked 2 years industrial insur. health and taught again. Would the question be clearer if stated "prior to initial teaching experience?"
>
> Thought that the characteristics, activities, tasks listed in the questionnaire played very significantly in developing teacher/student relationships.

Interest in the Study Topic

Comments in this category indicated that nurse educator activities and the teacher/student relationsip was a pertinent and relevant topic for investigation. However, the number of responses in this area was sparse. The following comments indicate the expressed interest.

> Am glad to see that you are looking at all the extra "jobs" that detract from teacher/student relationship.
>
> I am pleased to see a study being carried out in this area and will be interested in the results.

Issues Related to Teacher/Student Relationships

A wide variety of comments were included in this area, and they dealt primarily with problems encountered in the work setting such as marking papers, committee work, and clinical practice area. Workload of instructors also appeared to be an area of concern. Nurse educators appeared to be greatly concerned about the work environment in the classroom and clinical practice area. Concern regarding communication between students and staff personnel was also expressed. An interesting comment was made regarding faculty personnel discussing faculty members with students. The following comments were offered:

> We spend far too much time in meetings that are poorly organized, this takes away from time that could be spent in direct contact with students. There is little time during the week and during trimester breaks for planning and updating work -- a meeting or several meetings or workshops are scheduled. I mark papers at home, so I spend more time with students.
>
> I spend an enormous amount of time doing work at home because there isn't enough time to do it at the office and see students -- a considerable detracting factor.
>
> Our committee load is far too heavy and so is our clinical load -- both in numbers of students and in number of hours -- our present clinical calculation for LSEH's is unrealistic.
>
> The amount of time spent in clerical activities is also a detracting factor; writing up student evaluations takes up a considerable part of my time, if this could be dictated and then typed by a secretary there would be a considerable time saving.
>
> Student/teacher relationships are influenced by what teachers say about each other to students i.e. a student during counselling may complain about another teacher; they may also be varied by "ward" acceptance of the educational program; there should be an ongoing,

assertive presentation of the program at a supervisor level.

A direct line from instructor to administration (similar to head nurse to supervisor) with resulting action re: new ideas, improvements, suggestions would no doubt increase student respect for the instructor as a member of her profession.

We have all seen situations where all recognize that change would be better but we're powerless to effect change (e.g., a standing order that omits the dose of a medication).
- improvements in procedures.
- policy that permits R.N.A.'s to catheterize 8 days post op but intermediate students must wait till 15 days post op on anterior repairs.
- the need for instructors to be able to attend inservice programs in their specialty, etc.

SUMMARY

This chapter presented the data gathered from the respondents and provided a discussion of the data analysis. Frequency and percentage distributions were presented to describe the personal and professional data of the respondents.

Ranking of items by means was utilized to identify both the facilitator profile and detractor profile.

T-tests and one-way analysis of variance were used to determine statistically significant mean differences in the perceptions of respondents regarding the importance of personal and professional characteristics, instructional and non-instructional activities as facilitators and/or detractors.

Open-ended responses were classified and summarized. A sample of comments representing the concerns were presented and discussed.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter includes the summary, conclusion and implications of the study. The initial section of the chapter provides a summarization of the study, including its purpose, methodology, data analyses and findings. The second section presents the conclusions derived from the findings. The final section deals with some implications for education and for further research.

SUMMARY

The research literature suggests that interpersonal relationships and humanism are gaining importance in the field of education. Many curricula in nursing stress these concepts. This is evidenced by the inclusion of courses such as communications and human relations in the program of studies. Students are our hope for the future and therefore should expect a helping relationship from their teachers. Teachers also derive satisfaction from this relationship, but often they believe that maintainance activities, tasks and workload negatively affect the amount and kind of teacher/student interaction possible.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to identify perceptions of nurse educators, in two Alberta Diploma Schools of Nursing, regarding the personal and professional characteristics and instructional and non-instructional activities which facilitate or detract from the teacher/student relationship.

Sub-problems

The following subproblems were addressed in this study:

1. What personal and professional characteristics do nurse educators perceive as facilitating teacher/student relationship?

2. Which personal and professional characteristics are perceived by nurse educators as detracting from the teacher/student relationship?

3. What facets of instructional activities of nursing education are perceived as facilitating the teacher/student relationship?

4. What facets of instructional activities of nursing education are perceived as detracting from the teacher/student relationship?

5. Which tasks of the non-instructional activities in nursing education are perceived as facilitating the teacher/student relationship.

6. Which tasks of the non-instructional activities in nursing education are perceived as detracting from the teacher/student relationship?

7. To what extent do personal and professional variables of age, teaching experience, general nursing experience prior to teaching, educational preparation, place, extent and status of employment affect perceptions of respondents regarding the facilitators and detractors in the teacher/student relationship?

8. To what degree do the respondents perceive a discrepancy of personal and professional characteristics and instructional and non-instructional activities as facilitators and detractors to the teacher/student relationship?

Methodology

A Teacher/Student Relationship in Nursing questionnaire was developed for data collection. The instrument consisted of four sections related to: (1) personal and professional data; (2) personal and professional characteristics of teacher; (3) instructional related activities; and (4) non-instructional activities. In the final section the nurse educators were invited to comment on teacher/student relationships and/or the study. The questionnaire was distributed to all nursing instructors in two diploma schools of nursing. In order to guarantee anonymity, no identifying marks appeared on any of the questionnaires or any of the envelopes in which the questionnaires were returned. Each study participant was offered a summary of the study findings.

Data Analyses

Frequency and percentage distributions were used to discuss the personal and professional data profile of the nurse educators who participated in the study.

Means and rank order of means were used to determine importance of items in facilitating or detracting from the teacher/student relationship on the basis of personal and professional characteristics, instructional related activities and non-instructional activities.

One-way analysis of variance and t-tests were used to determine statistically significant mean differences among the perceptions of respondents, to identify the extent to which personal and professional data and characteristics; instructional related activities; and non-instructional activities affected the teacher/student relationship.

To determine the discrepancy gap of whether an item was considered to be more of a facilitator or detractor, the mean value of the detractor was subtracted from the mean value of the facilitator. The statistical analyses utilized were one-way analysis of variance and t-tests.

Nurse educator comments were classified under the following headings: General Reaction to the Instrument, Interest in the study, and Issues Related to Teacher/Student Relationships.

Findings

Personal and professional data profile. Slightly more than one half of the respondents were 35 years of age or younger. Approximately one half (51.2%) of all respondents indicated they had instructional responsibilities in both classroom and clinical areas. Fifty-five percent of the nurse educators reported they were involved in the hospital based nursing program with the remainder teaching in the college nursing program.

The largest proportion (81.4%) of nurse educators were prepared at the baccalaureate level while the next largest group indicated an R.N. plus post basic diploma as their highest level of education.

Seventy-two percent or slightly less than three quarters of the nurse educators indicated they were employed in full-time permanent positions. The remainder were employed in permanent part-time, temporary part-time or temporary full-time positions. The majority of the respondents indicated they had less than 9 years experience as a nurse educator and were in their present place of employment at least 3 years. Two-thirds of the nurse educators had 4 years or less nursing work experience prior to embarking on a teaching career.

Facilitators and Detractors

Personal and professional characteristics.

Respondents identified the characteristic of demonstrating skills, attitudes and values to be developed by the student as the most important item in facilitating the teacher/student relationship. Concern for each student as a person and welcomes and respects differences of opinion ranked second and third, respectively, in importance.

The characteristic regarded with respect which was ranked as the item which detracted to the greatest extent from the relationship of teacher with student was also found to occupy the fourth position as a facilitator. Stresses counselling to assist the student ranked second as a detractor while provides for meeting student group needs was ranked in the third position.

Nurse educators, however, indicated they perceived personal and professional characteristics to have little or no effect in detracting from the teacher/student relationship.

Instructional activities. Size of group in clinical instruction was ranked as the number one facilitator and detractor. The item student contact hours available to assist individual students was considered to be the second most important facilitator. The item size of classes in classroom instruction which was perceived as the third most important facilitator was also perceived by the respondents to detract to the second greatest extent. Time spent on curriculum planning meetings ranked as the third greatest detractor.

Non-instructional activities. Nurse educators perceived that time spent establishing rapport with staff in the clinical area was the most important facilitator from the non-instructional activities. The items time spent preparing for clinical assignments and time spent communicating with supervisory personnel in clinical area ranked second and third, respectively, in perceived importance as facilitators in the teacher/student relationship.

Time spent on clerical activities was perceived by the nurse educators to detract from the teacher/student relationship to the greatest extent. The items considered to occupy the second and third positions as detractors was time spent in faculty committee work and time spent in faculty meetings. These items were generally considered to have little facilitating effect to the teacher/student relationship.

Facilitators Profile Three out of the twenty-six items were considered to be of very great importance to facilitating the teacher/student relationship. These items were (1) size of group in clinical instruction; (2) demonstrates skills, attitudes, values to be developed by students; and (3) concern for each student as a person. Twelve of the remaining twenty-three items were rated as being of great importance. The respondents also indicated of the ten items in the area of personal and professional characteristics, nine were rated as having great to very great importance. The item stresses counselling to assist students in the area of personal and professional characteristics was considered to have moderate importance. It would appear nurse educators consider this area as being of great importance in facilitating the teacher/student relationship. Review of the literature supports this premise.

Detractor profile From the twenty-six items in the questionnaire, the one item that rated to the greatest extent as a detractor was size of group in clinical instruction. Size of classes in classroom instruction was rated in the second position as a detractor. Those items which were perceived by the respondents to detract to a moderate or great extent were listed in either the instructional or non-instructional activities, whereas, in the area of personal and professional characteristics the items were considered to have the least detracting effect.

Mean differences in perceptions of importance of personal and professional characteristics as facilitators. Four of the ten items in this section demonstrated statistically significant mean differences in perceptions of importance as facilitators in the teacher/student relationship. The personal and professional characteristic which most frequently demonstrated a statistically significant mean difference was concern for each student as a person. Concern with students character development rated second highest in demonstrating a statistically significant mean difference. The third and fourth characteristics with statistically significant mean differences in the instructors perception of importance were emphasizes learning about mutually satisfying teacher/student relationship and provides for meeting student group needs. The remainder of the personal and professional characteristics were not associated with statistically significant mean differences in perceptions of importance.

Mean differences in perceptions of importance of instructional activities as facilitators. Only 25 percent of the possible statistically significant mean differences in perceptions of importance of instructional activities as facilitators were demonstrated. Student contact hours available to assist individual students was the activity which most frequently demonstrated a statistically significant mean difference in perceptions as a facilitator in the teacher/student relationship. The second activity of the eight instructional activities in which a statistically significant mean difference occurred related to time spent on curriculum planning meetings. The remaining six instructional activities were not associated with statistically significant mean differences in instructors' perceptions as facilitating to the teacher/student relationship.

Mean differences in perceptions of importance of non-instructional activities as facilitators. The majority of non-instructional activities (75%) demonstrated statistically significant mean differences in the nurse educators perceptions of importance as facilitating the teacher relationship with students. Four non-instructional activities showed statistically significant mean differences equally. They were: time spent in faculty committee work; time spent establishing rapport with staff in clinical area; time spent communciating with supervisory personnel in clinical area; and time spent preparing for clinical assignments. The activities of time spent on teaching aids and time spent in faculty meetings also had equally occurring statistically significant mean differences in perceptions of importance in facilitating teacher/student relationships.

Mean differences in perceptions of importance of personal and professional characteristics as detractors. More than one half (60%) of the personal and professional characteristics demonstrated statistically significant mean differences in nurse educators perceptions of importance as detractors. Regarded with respect by students was the characteristic which most frequently demonstrated a statistically significant mean difference as a detractor. The characteristic which rated second highest in demonstrating a statistically significant mean difference in perceptions as a detractor was regarded as loyal and dependable by students. Four other personal and professional characteristics showed statistically significant mean differences in perceptions of importance as detracting from teacher/student relationship. They were: demonstrates skills, attitudes, values to be developed by student; emphasizes learning about mutually satisfying teacher/student relationship; provides meeting student group needs; and welcomes and respects differences in opinion. No statistically significant mean differences were identified in perceptions of importance as detracting from the teacher/student relationship in the four remaining personal and professional characteristics.

Mean differences in perceptions of importance of instructional activities as detractors. One-half of the eight instructional activities demonstrated statistically significant mean differences in perceptions of nurse educators of importance in detracting from teacher relationships with students. The instructional activity which most frequently associated with statistically significant mean differences in perceptions as detractor was time spent correcting assignments per week. The remaining three instructional activities in which statistically significant mean differences occurred were: hours of classroom teaching per week; hours of clinical teaching per week; and size of group in clinical instruction. These activities had equal representation in demonstrating statistically significant mean differences in importance as detractors to the teacher/student relationship.

Mean differences in perceptions of importance of non-instructional activities as detractors. Only three of the eight non-instructional activities demonstrated statistically significant mean differences in perceptions of importance as detractors. The most frequently occurring statistically significant mean difference was in time spent on teaching aids. Time spent on clerical activities and time spent in faculty committee work were equally represented in demonstrating statistically significant mean differences in perceptions of nurse educators of importance as detractors to the relationship of teacher with students. No statistically significant mean differences were identified in perception of importance as detractors in the remaining five non-instructional activities.

Discrepancy in mean differences in perceptions of importance of personal and professional characteristics as facilitators or detractors. Seven of the ten personal and professional characteristics demonstrated a discrepancy in statistically significant mean differences in nurse educators perceptions of importance as a facilitator to the teacher/student relationship. These characteristics were as follows: demonstrates skills, attitudes, values to be developed by students; emphasizes learning about mutually satisfying teacher/ student relationships; stresses counselling to assist students; demonstrates concern for character development of student; regarded as loyal and dependable by students; regarded with respect by students; and welcomes and respects differences of opinion. Each of these characteristics showed a discrepancy in statistically significant mean differences equally. No discrepancy occurred regarding characteristics as detractors.

Discrepancy in mean differences in perceptions of importance of instructional activities as facilitators or detractors. Two of the eight instructional activities demonstrated a discrepancy in statistically significant mean differences as facilitating the teacher/student relationship. The two activities which were perceived with the same frequency were hours of classroom instruction and size of group in clinical instruction. Only the instructional activity of time spent on curriculum planning meetings demonstrated a discrepancy in statistically significant mean differences in nurse educators perceptions of importance as detracting from the relationship of teacher and student.

Discrepancy in mean differences in perceptions of importance of non-instructional activities as facilitators or detractors. Of the eight activities appearing in this area, six were perceived by the nurse educators to show a discrepancy in statistically significant mean differences as facilitating the teacher/student relationship. Time spent preparing for clinical assignments was the most frequently occurring activity in which a discrepancy was perceived. The non- instructional activities of time spent on clinical activities and time spent communciating with supervisory personnel in clinical area were perceived by instructors to show a discrepancy in statistically significant mean differences as a facilitator with equal frequency. However, time spent on clerical activities also demonstrated a perceived discrepancy as a detractor. A perceived discrepancy by nurse educators in the statistically significant mean differences as detracting from the teacher/student relationship also occurred with the activities of time spent in faculty committee work, time spent in faculty meetings, and time spent preparing for committee meetings. Of the activities which demonstrated a discrepancy in statistically significant mean differences, only time spent on clerical activities was perceived as both a facilitator and a detractor to the teacher/student relationship.

CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions were based on the findings of the study:

1. Nurse educators perceived the following personal and professional characteristics as most important in facilitating the teacher/student relationship: demonstrates skills, attitudes and values to be developed by the student; concern for each student as a person; and welcomes and respects differences of opinions.

2. Personal and professional characteristics were generally considered to be facilitators and have little or no effect in detracting from the relationship between teacher and student.

3. In the area of instructional activities, size of group in clinical instruction was perceived by the respondents to be the most important item in facilitating the relationship between teacher and student. However, this item was also considered to detract from the relationship to the greatest extent.

4. Nurse educators viewed size of classes in classroom instruction of great importance as both a facilitator and detractor to the relationship between teacher and student.

5. From the non-instructional area instructors perceived time spent establishing rapport with staff in clini-

cal area, time spent preparing for clinical assignments and time spent communicating with supervisory personnel to have the most important facilitating effect on the teacher/student relationship.

6. The respondents perceived the non-instructional items of time spent on clerical activities, time spent on faculty committee work and meetings detracted to the greatest extent from the teacher/student relationship.

7. Non-instructional activities were generally not perceived by the respondents to facilitate the teacher/student relationship.

IMPLICATIONS

The data provided by this investigation resulted in some significant findings, however, it is recognized that much more empirical work is needed in the research area. Suggestions concerning implications for education must, therefore, be regarded cautiously.

Implications for Education

The findings of this study indicate that several tasks in instructional and non-instructional activities require further study. In most instances, personal and professional characteristics of faculty were considered to be facilitative, whereas, several instructional and non-instructional activities were viewed as detractors. This finding might imply nurse educators value these humanistic qualities.

Socialization of students into the nursing role is also indicated by the findings of demonstrating skills, attitudes and values to be developed. Possibly nurse educators perceive themselves as role models. Since students generally, according to the literature, model after the first clinical instructor they encounter, nurse educators should be cognizant of this supposition.

The findings indicate that concern is expressed regarding clinical size numbers. The fact that this item was rated highly as both a facilitator and detractor, indicates clearly, clinical group size is an area of great concern. In addition, size of classes in classroom instruction was considered, by the respondents, to have a facilitating and a detracting effect. It appears that the nursing program administrators might do well to consider what size of group is an optimal number in both areas. With increasing emphasis on humanism, in classroom/clinical areas, students as well as faculty may very well desire group sizes which allow for adequate interaction.

Nurse educators apparently consider the climate of the clinical environment as very important and, therefore, see the time spent preparing for clinical assignments and establishing rapport with hospital personnel as a valuable function. The result of this finding would suggest a closer working liaison between nurse educators and nursing service personnel should improve clinical climate and thereby enhance student learning. The literature supports the need for a humanisitic climate in order to decrease the stress level experienced by students in the clinical area. Further, the literature also suggests that establishing rapport between nurse educator and clinical agency personnel is one method toward humanizing the clinical climate.

Implications for Research

Although this study provided some useful information regarding the effects of personal and professional characteristics, and tasks and activities of nurse educators on teacher/student relationship, further research in the area might either support or refute the conclusions of this study. While it appears a great deal remains to be learned about all the variables and relationships with which this study was concerned, further research regarding teacher/student relationships in nursing education might expand the data base as follows:

1. Replication of this study with a larger sample to include nurse educators from university, college and hospital based nursing programs to determine if their perceptions of personal and professional characteristics, instructional and non-instructional activities as facilitators or detractors in teacher/student relationships differ significantly from the findings of this study.

2. Further research should be conducted using different methodologies to ascertain variables that facilitate and detract from the teacher/student relationship in nursing education.

3. Further research should be conducted involving the student nurse population to determine how their perceptions compare to those of nurse educator on the variables.

4. Further research should be conducted involving nurse educators, nursing service personnel and student nurses to determine the variables which facilitate a humanistic clinical environment and enhance student learning.

5. Replication of this study involving teachers in another college program, which includes practice setting experience, to determine if there is any similarity of the variables which are percieved as facilitators and detractors to the teacher/student relationship in nursing education.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

B. PERIODICALS

C. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

A. BOOKS

Adam, E. To Be A Nurse. Toronto: W.B. Saunders Company, 1980.

Archer, D.K. Humane Atmosphere Within The School. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company, 1976.

Ashley, J. & LaBelle, B.M. Education for Freeing Minds. In J.A. Williamson (Ed.), Current Perspectives in Nursing Education Volume One. St. Louis: C.V. Mosby Co., 1976.

Barritt, E.R. Academic Nurse Educators: Mobility Versus Stability. In J.A. Williamson (Ed.), Current Perspectives in Nursing Education Volume Two. St. Louis: C.V. Mosby Co., 1978.

Bernard, H.W. & Huckins, W.C. Humanism in the Classroom. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1974.

Bevis, E.O. Curriculum Building in Nursing a Process (2nd ed.). St. Louis: C.V. Mosby Co., 1978.

Bossert, S.T. Tasks and Social Relationships in Classrooms. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Bower, F.L. The Process of Planning Nursing Care (2nd ed.). St. Louis: C.V. Mosby Co., 1977.

Brophy, J.E. & Good, T.L. Teacher-Student Relationships Causes and Consequences. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1974.

Brown, G.I. Human Teaching for Human Learning. New York: The Viking Press, 1971.

Carkhuff, R.R. Helping & Human Relations Volume II. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969.

Clark, C.C. Classroom Skills for Nurse Educators Volume IV. New York: Springer Publishing Company, 1978.

Dreeben, R. The Nature of Teaching. Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1970.

Etzioni, A. (Ed.). The Semi-Professions and Their Organization: Teachers, Nurses, Social Workers. New York: Free Press, 1969.

Flanders, N.A. Analyzing Teaching Behavior. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1970.

________ & Nuthall, G. (Eds.). *The Classroom Behavior of Teachers*. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press Ltd., 1972.

Fox, D.J. *Fundamentals of Research in Nursing* (2nd ed.). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970.

Funk and Wagnall. *Standard Desk Dictionary.* Revised Edition. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Inc., 1977.

Gorman, A.H. *Teachers and Learners The Interactive Process of Education* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1974.

Heath, G.L. *The New Teacher*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1973.

Heidgerken, L.E. *Teaching and Learning in Schools of Nursing* (3rd ed.). Montreal: J.B. Lippincott, 1965.

Henson, K.T. & Henry, M.A. *Becoming Involved in Teaching.* Terre Haute, Indiana: Sycamore Press, 1976.

Herzberg, F.; Mausner, B. & Snyderman, B.B. *The Motivation to Work*. New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc., 1959.

Joyce, B.R. & Harootunian, B. *The Structure of Teaching*. Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1967.

Kramer, M. Educational Preparation for Nurses Roles In J.A. Williamson (Ed.). *Current Perspectives in Nursing Education* Volume One. St. Louis: C.V. Mosby Co., 1976.

Kron, T. *The Management of Patient Care* (4th ed.). Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders Company, 1976.

Lortie, D.C. *Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Miller, W.R. & Rose, H.C. *Instructors and Their Jobs* (3rd ed.). Chicago: American Technical Society, 1975.

Morrison, A. & McIntyre, D. *Teachers and Teaching* (2nd ed.). Baltimore: Penguin Education, 1973.

Mueller, J.H., Schuessler, K.F. & Costner, H.L. *Statistical Reasoning in Sociology* (3rd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1977.

Murray, R.B. & Zenter, J.P. *Nursing Concepts for Health Promotion*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1979.

Pine, G.J. & Boy, A.V. Learner Centered Teaching A Humanistic View. Denver: Love Publishing Company, 1977.

Panicucci, C.L. Faculty Development: Myth or Reality. In J.A. Williamson (Ed.). Current Perspectives in Nursing Education Volume Two. St. Louis: C.V. Mosby Co., 1978.

Smith, D.W. The Effect of Values on Clinical Teaching. In J.A. Williamson (Ed.). Current Perspectives in Nursing Education Volume One. St. Louis: C.V. Mosby Co., 1976.

Stanford, G. & Roark, A.E. Human Interaction in Education (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1974.

Stone, S. & Berger, M. Nursing Services and Education: An Analysis of Interorganizational Relationships. In J.A. Williamson (Ed.). Current Perspectives in Nursing Education Volume Two. St. Louis: C.V. Mosby Co., 1978.

Williamson, J.A. More Professor Than Practitioner? In J.A. Williamson (Ed.). Current Persectives In Nursing Education Volumn One. St. Louis: C.V. Mosby Co., 1976.

Wittmer, J. & Myrick, R.D. Facilitative Teaching: Theory And Practice. Pacific Palisades, California: Goodyear Publishing Co. Inc., 1974.

B. PERIODICALS

Barr, F. Are Your Students Positive About Their Experience In The Clinical Area? The Canadian Nurse, 1980, 76 (9), 48-50.

Brown, S.T. Faculty And Student Perceptions of Effective Clinical Teachers. Journal of Nursing Education, 1981, 20 (9), 4-15.

Busl, L.D. The Teacher As Manager Of The Learning Environment. Journal of Nursing Education, 1981, 20 (5), 42-47.

Carter, L.B. Improving Relationship Between Nursing Service and Education in the Clinical Agency. Journal of Nursing Education, 1979, 18 (7), 7-12.

Chase, F.S. Factors For Satisfaction In Teaching. Phi Delta Kappan, 1951, 33, 127-132.

Combs, A.W. Humanistic Education: Too Tender For A Tough World? Phi Delta Kappan, 1981, 62 (2), 446-449.

Cotanch, P.H. Self-Actualization and Professional Socialization of Nursing Students in the Clinical Laboratory Experience. Journal of Nursing Education, 1981, 20 (8), 4-14.

DeTornyay, R. Changing Student Relationships, Roles and Responsibilities. Nursing Outlook, 1977, 25 (3), 188-193.

Durrant, L. The Student of Nursing Needs - The Consumer of Education. Journal of Nursing Education, 1978, 17 (6), 15-19.

Edgerton, S.K. Teachers in Role Conflict: The Hidden Dilemma. Phi Delta Kappan, 1977, 59 (2), 120-122.

Fishel, A.H. & Johnson, G.A. The Three-Way Conference - Nursing Student, Nursing Supervisor and Nursing Educator. Journal of Nursing Education, 1981, 20 (6), 18-23.

Fry, M.S. An Analysis of the Role of a Nurse-Educator. Journal of Nursing Education, 1975, 14 (1), 5-10.

Garrett, A., Manual D. & Vincent, C. Stressful Experiences Identified By Student Nurses. Journal of Nursing Education, 1976, 15 (6), 9-21.

Grassi-Russo, N. & Morris, P.B. The Attitudes of Freshman Nursing Students. Journal of Nursing Education, 1981, 20 (6), 9-17.

Guerin, D.H. Do You Underestimate Your Students? Journal of Nursing Education, 1981, 20 (4), 17-21.

Hall, B.A. & Mitsunaga, B.K. Education of The Nurse to Promte Interpersonal Attraction. Journal of Nursing Education, 1979, 18 (5), 16-21.

Hicks, B.C., & Westphal, M. Integration of Clinical and Academic Nursing at the Hospital Clinical Unit Level. Journal of Nursing Education, 1977, 16 (4), 6-9.

Holliman, J.M. Analyzing Faculty Workload. Nursing Outlook, 1977, 25 (11), 721-723.

Hutchinson, S. & Talley, N. The Group Supervisory Conference. Journal of Nursing Education, 1974, 13 (4), 13-17.

Jackson, M.O. Instructor And Course Evaluation Based On Student Identified Criteria. Journal of Nursing Education, 1977, 16 (2), 8-13.

Johnson, M.H. & Zone, J.B. Concentrating On The Process Of Learning While Teaching Clearly Defined Communication Skills. *Journal of Nursing Education,* 1981, *20* (3), 3-14.

Jones, S.L. & Jones, P.K. Nursing Student Definitions Of The "Real" Nurse. *Journal of Nursing Education,* 1977, *16* (4), 15-21.

Ketefian, S. A Paradigm For Faculty Evaluation. *Nursing Outlook*, 1977, *25* (11), 718-720.

Kiker, M. Characteristics of the Effective Teacher. *Nursing outlook*, 1973, *21* (11), 721-723.

King, V.G. A Confluent Approach To Nursing Education Through Group Process. *Nurse Educator*, 1978, *3* (3), 20-25.

Kinsey, D.C. Implementation of Peer Review Within A Baccalaureate Nursing Program. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 1981, *20* (5), 29-33.

Knoop, R. Job Satisfaction of Teachers and Attainment of School Goals. *The Canadian Administrator,* 1981, *21* (1).

LaMonica, E.L. & Karshmer, J.F. Empathy; Educating Nurses in Professional Practice. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 1978, *17* (2), 3-11.

Lee, A. How Nurses Rate With The Public. *R.N.*, 1979, *42* (6), 25-39.

Loree, D.J. & Leckie, I. Nursing Roles and Relationships: Perceptions of Baccalaureate Students. *Nursing Papers,* 1977, *9* (3), 109-118.

Loree, D.J. & Leckie,I. Why Nursing? Occupation and Career Perceptions of Nursing Students in New Brunswick. *The Canadian Nurse*, 1977, *73* (21) 31-33.

Mansfield, E. Teaching Group Leadership: Concept, Illustration, Analogy and Role Model. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 1977, *16* (2), 3-7.

Mauksch, I.G. Faculty Practice: A Professional Imperative. *Nurse Educator*, 1980, *5* (3), 21-24.

Meleca, C.B., Schimpfhauser, F., Witteman, J.K., & Sachs, L. Clinical Instruction in Nursing: A National Survey. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 1981, *20* (8), 32-40.

Mesolella, D.W. Teachers - You Are Tespassing! The Canadian Nurse, 1970, 66 (7), 21.

Mesolella, D.W. Caring Begins In The Teacher-Student Relationship. The Canadian Nurse, 1974, 70 (12), 15.

McPhail, F.J. Use of Part-Time Teachers Benefits Students and Faculty. The Canadian Nurse, 1970, 66 (7), 36-37.

Nash, G. Faculty Evaluation. Nurse Educator, 1977, 2 (6), 9-13.

Noonan, K.A. How to Increase Clinical Learning Opportunities in a Psychiatric Nursing Setting. Journal of Nursing Education. 1979, 18 (4), 5-15.

Norman, E.M. & Haumann, L. A Model For Judging Teaching Effectiveness, Nurse Educator, 1978, 3 (2), 29-34.

O'Connor, A.B. Sources of Conflict For Faculty Members. Journal of Nursing Education, 1978, 17 (5), 35-38.

Paduano, M.A. The Greening Of The Classroom. Journal of Nursing Education, 1975, 14 (2), 20-24.

Peters, V.J. 'Ivory Tower' vs Practice: The Real Split in Nursing. R.N., 1980, 43 (9), 107-110.

Poulin, M.A. Accountability: A Professional Imperative. The Canadian Nurse, 1977, 73 (2), 30-33.

Pugh, E.J. Dynamics of Teaching-Learning Interaction. Nursing Forum, 1976, 15 (1), 47-58.

Ratsoy, E. & Sloan, L.V. Effective Teaching As A Focus For Supervisory Activity. The Canadian Administrator, 1981, 20 (7)

Rauen, K.C. The Clinical Instructor As Role Model. Journal of Nursing Education, 1974, 13 (3), 33-40.

Scheideman, J.M. Listening A Response To Student Protest. Nursing Outlook, 1973, 21 (12), 789-792.

Sergiovanni, T.J. Factors Which Affect Satisfaction And Dissatisfaction Of Teachers. Journal of Educational Administration, 1967, 5 (1), 66-82.

Strohmann, R. Improving Student Clinical Experiences. Nursing Outlook, 1977, 25 (7), 460-462.

Stuebbe, B. Student And Faculty Perspectives On The Role Of A Nursing Instructor. Journal of Nursing Education, 1980, 19 (7), 4-9.

Telnes, L., VanGaalen, J., & Albrecht, J. As Others See Us. The Canadian Nurse, 1966, 62 (10), 49-54.

Trautman, M.J. An Instructor's Diary. Nursing Outlook, 1977, 25 (11), 697-701.

Watson, J. How to Select Clinical Agencies for Clinical Experience in Baccalaureate Nursing Eduction. Journal of Nursing Education, 1979, 18 (2), 29-35.

Williams, M.L. Effects Of Clinical Setting On Anxiety And Achievement In Psychiatric Nursing Education. Journal of Nursing Education, 1979, 18 (2), 4-14.

C. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Alberta Hospital Association. Nursing Manpower. Edmonton: Alberta Hospital Association, 1980.

Cadman, L.E. Evaluation of Alberta Nursing Instructors. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1977.

Cooper, N.C. Instructor Evaluation In Community Colleges. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1972.

Davis, L.M.G. Job Satisfaction Among Alberta Nurse Educators. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1980.

Holdaway, E.A. Teacher Satisfaction: An Alberta Report. Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1978.

Richardson, S.L. A Special Purpose Master's In Nursing Program For Alberta Nurse Educators. Edmonton: A Research Project Funded by the Alberta Association of Registered Nurses, 1979.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

CENTRE FOR THE STUDY
OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION
FACULTY OF EDUCATION
THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

1981-05-19

Dear Nurse Educator:

Teacher relationships with their students may be of interest to you. The purpose of the attached questionnaire is to obtain input concerning your perceptions of which tasks and activities in your current teaching position affect teacher/student relationships. This questionnaire is being circulated to one college and one hospital diploma program in Edmonton. The data received will be analyzed and a project prepared. The project is being perused under the direction of Dr. A. G. Konrad and will be placed in the Department of Educational Administration library at the University of Alberta.

I would request your assistance in completing the questionnaire and returning it in the envelope provided. The questionnaire should take 15 - 20 minutes of your time to complete. I hope the results of the study will be of value to you. A summary of my findings will be sent as a token of my appreciation for participating in my project.

I am looking forward to receiving your input. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely yours,

Marie L. Middleton

MARIE L. MIDDLETON, R.N., B.Sc.N.

Enclosures

7-133B, EDUCATION NORTH, EDMONTON, ALBERTA, CANADA • T6G 2G5 • TELEPHONE (403) 432-2217

TEACHER/STUDENT RELATIONSHIP IN NURSING EDUCATION
QUESTIONNAIRE

For Keypunch
Use Only
1 2 3 4

A. Personal and Professional Data
In the box provided, please write the letter which represents the most accurate response to each item

1. Program in which you presently teach: ☐ 5
   a. College diploma program
   b. Hospital diploma program

2. Age to nearest birthday ☐ 6
   a. 21 to 25
   b. 26 to 30
   c. 31 to 35
   d. 36 to 40
   e. 41 to 45
   f. 46 to 50
   g. over 51

3. Highest level of education:
   a. R. N. Diploma
   b. R. N. plus post-basic diploma in nursing ☐ 7
   c. Baccalaureate degree
   d. Master's degree, Please specify ___________
   e. Other, Please specify ___________________

4. Status and extent of present nursing education employment:
   a. 0 to 49% of a temporary full time position,
   b. 0 to 49% of a permanent full time position, ☐ 8
   c. 50 to 74% of a temporary full time position,
   d. 50 to 74% of a permanent full time position,
   e. 75 to 100% of a temporary full time position,
   f. 75 to 100% of a permanent full time position,

5. Areas of major teaching responsibility
   a. Classroom instruction
   b. Clinical instruction ☐ 9
   c. Approximately equal classroom and clinical instruction

6. Total amount of nursing work prior to teaching experience in nursing education.
   a. Less than 1 year
   b. 1 to 2 years
   c. 3 to 4 years
   d. 5 to 6 years
   e. 7 to 8 years
   f. over 8 years

☐ 10

7. Total amount of teaching experience in nursing education:
   a. less than 1 year
   b. 1 to 2 years
   c. 3 to 4 years
   d. 5 to 6 years
   e. 7 to 8 years
   f. over 8 years

☐ 11

8. Length of present employment:
   a. less than 1 year
   b. 1 to 2 years
   c. 3 to 4 years
   d. 5 to 6 years
   e. 7 to 8 years
   f. over 8 years

☐ 12

Please use the following response key throughout the remainder of the questionnaire. For your convenience, the key is reproduced at the top of each subsequent page.

Response Key

	1	2	3	4	5
Facilitates:	No Importance	Some Importance	Moderate Importance	Great Importance	Very Great Importance
Detracts:	No Extent	Some Extent	Moderate Extent	Great Extent	Very Great Extent

B. Teacher/Student Relationships

The following list identifies personal and professional characteristics which may affect teacher/student relationships in nursing education. Using the key provided, please indicate your perception of the level of importance of each characteristic in facilitating this relationship and the extent to which this characteristic detracts from the relationship in your current program.

Example Item:

Salary you receive: (Facilitates) F 1 [✓ 2] 3 4 5
(Detracts) D [✓ 1] 2 3 4 5

(Using the key provided, the number circled indicates that the respondent perceives the salary received as having some importance in facilitating the relationship; however, he/she perceives that salary received does not detract from the relationship.)

Response Key

	1	2	3	4	5
Facilitates:	No Importance	Some Importance	Moderate Importance	Great Importance	Very Great Importance
Detracts:	No Extent	Some Extent	Moderate Extent	Great Extent	Very Great Extent

Personal and Professional Characteristics of Teacher

			Importance	For Keypunch Use Only
9.	Demonstrates skills, attitudes, and values that are to be developed by the students	F	1 2 3 4 5	13
		D	1 2 3 4 5	14
10.	Emphasizes learning about the development of mutually satisfying teacher/student relationships	F	1 2 3 4 5	15
		D	1 2 3 4 5	16
11.	Stresses counselling to assist the student with personal problems	F	1 2 3 4 5	17
		D	1 2 3 4 5	18
12.	Demonstrates concern for character development of students	F	1 2 3 4 5	19
		D	1 2 3 4 5	20
13.	Demonstrates concern for each student as a person	F	1 2 3 4 5	21
		D	1 2 3 4 5	22
14.	Makes provision for meeting student group needs	F	1 2 3 4 5	23
		D	1 2 3 4 5	24
15.	Students regard me as loyal and dependable	F	1 2 3 4 5	25
		D	1 2 3 4 5	26
16.	Students regard me with respect	F	1 2 3 4 5	27
		D	1 2 3 4 5	28
17.	Welcomes differences of opinion and treats them with respect	F	1 2 3 4 5	29
		D	1 2 3 4 5	30
18.	Shares own thinking with students	F	1 2 3 4 5	31
		D	1 2 3 4 5	32

Response Key

	1	2	3	4	5
Facilitates:	No Importance	Some Importance	Moderate Importance	Great Importance	Very Great Importance
Detracts:	No Extent	Some Extent	Moderate Extent	Great Extent	Very Great Extent

C. The following represents a range of instructional activities which may be viewed as facilitating the teacher/student relationship or detracting from the relationship. Please circle the number which indicates your perception of the level of importance which each activity facilitates and the level of importance which each activity detracts from the teacher/student relationship.

F = Facilitates D = Detracts

Instructional Related Activities	Importance	For Keypunch Use Only
19. Number of hours of classroom teaching per week	F 1 2 3 4 5	33
	D 1 2 3 4 5	34
20. Number of student contact hours available to assist individual students	F 1 2 3 4 5	35
	D 1 2 3 4 5	36
21. Number of hours of clinical teaching per week	F 1 2 3 4 5	37
	D 1 2 3 4 5	38
22. Preparation time available during official workday	F 1 2 3 4 5	39
	D 1 2 3 4 5	40
23. Amount of time spent correcting assignments per week	F 1 2 3 4 5	41
	D 1 2 3 4 5	42
24. Size of classes in classroom instruction	F 1 2 3 4 5	43
	D 1 2 3 4 5	44
25. Size of group in clinical instruction	F 1 2 3 4 5	45
	D 1 2 3 4 5	46
26. Time spent on curriculum planning meetings	F 1 2 3 4 5	47
	D 1 2 3 4 5	48

Response Key

	1	2	3	4	5
Facilitates:	No Importance	Some Importance	Moderate Importance	Great Importance	Very Great Importance
Detracts:	No Extent	Some Extent	Moderate Extent	Great Extent	Very Great Extent

D. The following represents a range of non-instructional activities which may be viewed as facilitating or detracting from the teacher/student relationship. Please circle the number which indicates your perception of importance which each activity facilitates and the level of importance which each activity detracts from the teacher/student relationship.

F = Facilitates D = Detracts

	Non - Instructional Activites	Importance	For Keypunch Use Only
27.	Amount of time spent on clerical activities	F 1 2 3 4 5	49
		D 1 2 3 4 5	50
28.	Amount of time engaged in setting up and operating teaching aids for instructional purposes	F 1 2 3 4 5	51
		D 1 2 3 4 5	52
29.	Time spent in faculty committee work.	F 1 2 3 4 5	53
		D 1 2 3 4 5	54
30.	Amount of time spent in faculty meetings	F 1 2 3 4 5	55
		D 1 2 3 4 5	56
31.	Time spent establishing working rapport with unit staff in clinical area	F 1 2 3 4 5	57
		D 1 2 3 4 5	58
32.	Time spent communicating with supervisory personnel in clinical area	F 1 2 3 4 5	59
		D 1 2 3 4 5	60

Response Key

	1	2	3	4	5
Facilitates:	No Importance	Some Importance	Moderate Importance	Great Importance	Very Great Importance
Detracts:	No Extent	Some Extent	Moderate Extent	Great Extent	Very Great Extent

Non - Instructional Activities		Importance	For Keypunch Use Only
33. Amount of time spent preparing for committee meetings	F	1 2 3 4 5	61
	D	1 2 3 4 5	62
34. Time spent in preparing for clinical assignments	F	1 2 3 4 5	63
	D	1 2 3 4 5	64

Any comments which you have concerning teacher/student relationships and/or this particular questionnaire would be appreciated.

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Your input is appreciated.

APPENDIX B

CORRESPONDENCE

CENTRE FOR THE STUDY
OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION
FACULTY OF EDUCATION
THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

11732 - 39A Avenue
Edmonton, Alberta
T6J 0P2

May 21, 1981

Ms. A. Judy Prowse, Chairperson
Health Sciences Department
Grant MacEwan Community College
Edmonton, Alberta

Dear Judy,

Further to our meeting of April 27, 1981 regarding the explanation of my project plans and request for circulation of my questionnaire on Teacher/Student Relationships in Nursing Education, I wish to thank you for allowing me to speak to the faculty on this topic at the Faculty Departmental Meeting.

I will be circulating my questionnaire within the next week and am appreciative of your offer of assistance in the distribution and collection of the completed questionnaires.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Marie L. Middleton

MARIE L. MIDDLETON

MLM/dg

CENTRE FOR THE STUDY
OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION
FACULTY OF EDUCATION
THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

11732 - 39A Avenue
Edmonton, Alberta
T6J 0P2

May 21, 1981

Miss Gloria Bauer
Director - Nursing Education
Royal Alexandra Hospital
School of Nursing
Edmonton, Alberta

Dear Gloria,

Further to our meeting of May 7, 1981 regarding the explanation of my project plans and request for circulation of my questionnaire on Teacher/Student Relationships in Nursing Education, I wish to thank you for allowing me to speak to the faculty on this topic at your weekly luncheon meeting.

I will be circulating my questionnaire within the next week, and am appreciative of your offer of assistance in the distribution and collection of the completed questionnaire.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Marie L. Middleton

MARIE L. MIDDLETON

MLM/dg

7-133B, EDUCATION NORTH, EDMONTON, ALBERTA, CANADA • T6G 2G5 • TELEPHONE (403) 432-2217

CENTRE FOR THE STUDY
OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION
FACULTY OF EDUCATION
THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

1981 06 11

Dear Nurse Educator:

Recently a questionnaire on Teacher/Student Relationship in Nursing Education was distributed to you. If you have already completed the questionnaire, I would like to take this opportunity to thank you again for your assistance. If you have not as yet found time to respond, I would request that you do so at your earliest convenience. I look forward to receiving your input which is appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Marie L Middleton

Marie L. Middleton, R.N. B.Sc.N.

MLM/dg

7-133B, EDUCATION NORTH, EDMONTON, ALBERTA, CANADA • T6G 2G5 • TELEPHONE (403) 432-2217